Book Draft: BRILL Publishers

Title: *The Anonymous Old English Homily: Sources, Composition, and Variation*

Editors: Winfried Rudolf, Susan Irvine

Draft: 19 June 2020

This Book has appeared in 2021 under the same title.

https://brill.com/view/title/58910?contents=editorial-content

L1 Acknowledgements

The present volume is the result of several years of collaboration between its editors on the topic of early English homiletic literature and its sources. We are indebted to the Alexander von Humboldt-Foundation for supporting this collaboration through the Anneleise Maier Research Award which Susan Irvine received in 2015, which not only enabled preliminary work on what was to become the ECHOE Project, but also allowed us to hold the 2017 conference at Göttingen where many of the contributions collected here were first presented. We are also grateful to University College London for awarding an Honorary Visiting Professorship to Winfried Rudolf from 2015 to 2020, and to the Lichtenberg-Kolleg at the University of Göttingen for awarding a research fellowship to Susan Irvine in 2017. Without such invaluable support, and the advice of many of our colleagues, ECHOE would not have become possible. The project, which was formally established in 2018 at Göttingen, currently receives funding from the European Research Council under the European Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme. The editors would also like to give thanks to Lukas Dorfbauer for sharing his discoveries of new Angers witnesses with us, to Colleen Curran, Julia Crick, and David Ganz for palaeographical advice, to Thomas N. Hall, Brandon Hawk, Paul Langeslag, Rosalind Love, and Charles D. Wright for their helpful comments and corrections, and to Amy Faulkner and Julie K. Kraft for their assistance in preparing this volume for publication.

W.R. and S.I.

L1 Abbreviations and Short Titles

L2 (For full references, see Bibliography)

ABR	*American Benedictine Review*
Add.	Additional
ANQ	*ANQ: American Notes and Queries*
Archiv	*Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*
art(s).	article(s)
ASE	*Anglo-Saxon England*
ASMMF	Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile
ASPR	Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records
Assmann	*Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben*, ed. B. Assmann (cited by item number)
BaP	Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa
BAV	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
Bazire-Cross	*Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies*, ed. Joyce Bazire and James E. Cross (cited by homily number)
Belfour	*Twelfth-Century Homilies in MS. Bodley 343*, ed. A. O. Belfour (cited by homily number)
BH	*Blickling Homilies of the Tenth Century*, ed. R. Morris (homilies cited as “Blickling” followed by Roman number)
BHL	*Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, ed. Bollandists, 2 vols. and supplement (cited by item number)

Bischoff, *Katalog*	Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*, 4 vols., vol. 4 ed. Birgit Ebersperger (cited by item number)
BCLL	*Bibliography of Celtic Latin Literature*, ed. M. Lapidge and R. Sharpe (cited by item number)
BL	British Library
BM	Bibliothèque municipale
BnF	Bibliothèque nationale de France
Bosworth-Toller	*An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth*, ed. T. Northcote Toller
Brotanek	R. Brotanek, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur altenglischen Literatur und Kirchengeschichte* (cited by item number)
BSB	Bayerische Staatsbibliothek
CCC	Corpus Christianorum, Claves
CCCC	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievalis
CCM	Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum
CCSA	Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina
CH I	*Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series*, ed. Peter Clemoes (cited by item number)
CH II	*Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series*, ed. Malcolm R. Godden (cited by item number)
CLA	E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 11 vols. and supplement (cited by volume and item number)

CLH	Donnchadh Ó Corráin, *Clavis Litterarum Hibernensium*, 3 vols. (cited by volume and item number)
CPG	*Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, ed. M Geerard, 5 vols. (cited by item number)
CPL	*Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, ed. E. Dekkers and A. Gaar (cited by item number)
CPPM	*Clavis Patristica Pseudoepigraphorum Medii Aevi*, ed. J. Machielsen, 5 vols. (cited by volume and item number)
CSASE	Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
CUL	Cambridge, University Library
DOE	*Dictionary of Old English,* ed. Cameron et al. (cited for short titles of homilies and Cameron numbers, such as HomM, HomS, HomU, LS)
ÉA	*Études augustiniennes*
ECHOE	Electronic Corpus of Anonymous Homilies in Old English Project
EEMF	Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile
EETS	Early English Text Society
EME	*Early Medieval Europe*
ES	*English Studies*
Fadda	*Nuove omelie anglosassoni della rinascenza benedettina*, ed. A. M. Luiselli Fadda (cited by homily number)
Fontes	*Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: A Register of Written Sources Used by Anglo-Saxon Authors*, version CD-ROM Version 1.1 (Oxford, 2002)
FS	*Frühmittelalterliche Studien*

Gneuss/Lapidge	H. Gneuss and M. Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (cited by item number)
Hom.	*Homilia*
Irvine	*Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343*, ed. S. Irvine (cited by homily number)
JEGP	*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*
JML	*The Journal of Medieval Latin*
KCLMS	King's College London Medieval Studies
Ker, *Catalogue*	N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (cited by item number)
LS	W. W. Skeat, ed., *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*
LSE	*Leeds Studies in English*
MANCASS	Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies
MÆ	*Medium Ævum*
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
MJ	*Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch*
MLQ	*Modern Language Quarterly*
MP	*Modern Philology*
MRTS	Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies
MS(S)	manuscript(s)
MS	*Mediaeval Studies*
N&Q	*Notes and Queries*

Napier	*Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit*, ed. Arthur S. Napier (cited by homily number)
NM	*Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*
n.s.	new series
PBA	*Proceedings of the British Academy*
PG	Patrologia Graeca, ed. J. P. Migne, 162 vols. (Paris, 1857–66) (cited by volume and column number)
PL	Patrologia Latina, ed. J. P. Migne, 221 vols. (Paris, 1844–64) (cited by volume and column number)
PMLA	*Publications of the Modern Language Association*
Pope	*Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, ed. John C. Pope, 2 vols. (cited by homily number)
PQ	*Philological Quarterly*
OE	Old English
OEN	*Old English Newsletter*
o.s.	Original Series
RA	*Recherches augustiniennes*
RB	*Revue Bénédictine*
RBMA	*Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, ed. F. Stegmüller and N. Reinhardt, 11 vols. (cited by volume and item number)
RES	*The Review of English Studies*
SASLAC	*Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture*, ed. F. Biggs, T. Hill, et al., recently renamed as *Sources of Old English and Anglo-Latin Literary Culture* (*SOEALLC*) at https://github.com/SOEALLC/

SE	*Sacris Erudiri*
SELIM	*Journal of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature*
s.s.	Supplementary Series
TASS	Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series
Tristram	*Vier altenglische Predigten aus der heterodoxen Tradition*, ed. H. L. C. Tristram (cited by homily number)
TUeP	Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie
VH	*The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, ed. D. G. Scragg (homilies cited as "Vercelli" followed by Roman number)
ZfcP	*Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*
ZfdA	*Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*

L1 List of Figures and Plates

Fig. 1: Vertical Text Distribution on fol. 139 of Épinal, BM 161.

Image 1: Épinal, BM 161 (74), fol. 139r. © Épinal, Bibliothèque municipale 2019.

Image 2: Épinal, BM 161 (74), fol. 139v. © Épinal, Bibliothèque municipale 2019.

L1 Notes on Contributors

Aidan Conti is Professor in Medieval Philology at the University of Bergen where he is presently co-ordinator for the Research Group in Medieval Philology. His publications explore medieval Latin in Scandinavia, medieval homiletics, and the manuscript contexts for the Homiliary of Angers. His research on editorial methods led to his serving on the editorial team for the Handbook of Stemmatology: History, Methodology, Digital Approaches which will be published by De Gruyter, fall 2020, and for which he wrote a chapter on the typology of variants.

Robert Getz is an Assistant Professor at the Centre for Medieval Studies at the University of Toronto and co-editor of the Dictionary of Old English. He has published on Old English language and literature in journals such as *Anglia*, the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, *NOWELE*, and *Studia Neophilologica*.

Thomas N. Hall writes mainly on Old English and Medieval Latin sermons and apocrypha. His edited books include *Via Crucis: Essays on Early Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross; Source of Wisdom: Old English and Early Medieval Latin Studies in Honour of Thomas D. Hill;* and *Anglo-Saxon Books and Their Readers: Essays in Celebration of Helmut Gneuss's 'Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts.'* He has taught at the University of Illinois at Chicago and the University of Notre Dame and is presently a researcher on the Electronic Corpus of Anonymous Homilies in Old English Project at the University of Göttingen.

Susan Irvine is Quain Professor of English Language and Literature at University College London. She is the author of *Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343* (1993) and *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle MS E* (2004), and co-author (with Malcolm Godden) of *The Old English Boethius* (2009) (winner of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists 'Best Edition' Prize), and *The Old English Boethius with Verse Prologues and Epilogues* (2012). She is President of the Society of Teachers of Old English in Britain and Ireland, and serves on various international Advisory Boards and Councils. In 2015 she was awarded an Anneliese Maier Research Award by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

Esther Lemmerz is a doctoral candidate and researcher at the Electronic Corpus of Homilies in Old English (ECHOE) project at the University of Göttingen, where she also teaches Old and Middle English literature and culture. Currently, she is finishing a doctoral dissertation on Latin quotations in anonymous Old English homilies and saints' lives. She holds master's degrees in Medieval Studies from the University of Leeds and University of Bonn. Her research focuses on Old English homilies and saints' lives, including their composition and transmission as well as their Latin sources. She is particularly interested in Old English-Latin bilingualism in early medieval England.

Stephen Pelle is an Assistant Professor at the Centre for Medieval Studies at the University of Toronto and an Editor at the Dictionary of Old English. His current research focuses on the Latin sources of Old and early Middle English homilies, a topic on which he is now writing a monograph. He has also published on Latin and Old Norse preaching texts, as well as on the Old Saxon *Heliand* and the circulation of the biblical apocrypha in the medieval West.

Thijs Porck is an Assistant Professor of Medieval English at the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society, teaching Old English, Middle English, Tolkien and Medieval studies. He has published widely on Old English textual criticism, *Beowulf*, the fiction and scholarship of J. R. R. Tolkien, the history of Old English studies as well as early medieval notions of old age. He is a cultural historian of early medieval England, with a background in medieval history as well as English language and literature. His latest monograph *Old Age in Early Medieval England: A Cultural History* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2019) is the first book-length study of the cultural conceptualisation of growing old in Anglo-Saxon England. Multidisciplinary in approach, this book makes use of a wide variety of sources, ranging from the visual arts to hagiography, homiletic literature and heroic poetry.

Winfried Rudolf is Professor of Medieval English Language and Literature at the University of Göttingen (Germany). He is an expert on European palaeography before the year 1200 and specializes in Insular manuscripts of that period. Other interests include the study of medieval liturgical practices, homiletic literature, digital editing, and the recovery of hitherto unknown manuscript sources. He is the director of the Vercelli School of Medieval European Palaeography (VSMEP), an international education project that teaches ancillary skills in the historical disciplines to international students and contributes

to the preservation of cultural heritage. He is also the Principal Investigator of the ERC-funded project Electronic Corpus of Anonymous Homilies in Old English (ECHOE) and Honorary Visiting Professor at University College London from 2015–2020.

Donald G. Scragg has been a member of staff in the Department of English at the University of Manchester for over forty years (with brief periods of secondment to the Universities of Cambridge, Colombia-Missouri and Connecticut). He is the founding father of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies (MANCASS), and Teachers of Old English in Britain and Ireland (TOEBI), and established the Toller Memorial lecture series. Professor Scragg's published work includes editions of Old English poetry and prose, notably *The Battle of Maldon* and *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts,* and many collections of essays by others, including a number in the MANCASS Publications series. He has also written extensively on aspects of manuscripts containing Old English, an interest which culminated in *A Conspectus of Scribal Hands Writing English, 960–1100*, of which I am currently producing a second edition.

Robert K. Upchurch is Professor of English at the University of North Texas. His recent work concentrates on Old English homilies, particularly those of Ælfric of Eynsham, and sermon manuscripts from Anglo-Saxon England. He has recently completed a study of two Old English homilies and the liturgical rites they accompany, and he is currently working with a colleague on editions and translations of fifteen homilies and eight occasional pieces by Ælfric.

Jonathan Wilcox is Professor of English and Collegiate Fellow at the University of Iowa, where he specializes in medieval literature and culture. He has published widely on Old English literature, particularly on homilies, manuscripts, and on emotions and gestures. He is currently struggling with the idea of humour, as seen in the recent essays, "Understatement and Incongruity: Humour in the Literature of Anglo-Saxon England," in *Humour in the Arts: New Perspectives*, ed. Vivienne Westbrook and Shun-liang Chao (New York: Routledge, 2019), pp. 59–77, and "Humour and the *Exeter Book* Riddles: Incongruity in *Feþegeorn* (R. 31)," in *Riddles at Work in the Early Medieval Tradition: Words, Ideas, Interactions*, ed. Megan Cavell and Jennifer Neville (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020).

Samantha Zacher

Samantha Zacher is Professor of English and Medieval Studies at Cornell University. Her research focuses on Old English homilies and biblical literature, and on forms of anti-Judaism in pre-modernity. Her books include *Rewriting the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon Verse: Becoming the Chosen People* (Bloomsbury Academic, 2013); and *Preaching the Converted: the Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Book Homilies (*University of Toronto Press, 2009). She has also edited *Imagining the Jew in Anglo-Saxon Literature and Culture* (University of Toronto Press, 2016); and co-edited *A Companion to British Literature* (4 vols.) with Robert DeMaria and Jr., Heesok Chang (Wiley Blackwell, 2014), and *New Readings in the Vercelli Book* with Andy Orchard (University of Toronto Press, 2009). She is currently working on a new monograph about conceptions of Jewish disease and contagion from Antiquity to Early Modernity.

L1 Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

List of Plates

Notes on Contributors

Introduction

Winfried Rudolf and Susan Irvine

The Corpus of Old English Anonymous Homilies

Donald G. Scragg

Sourcing Old English Anonymous Homilies: The Pioneers (Max Förster, Rudolph Willard, and J. E. Cross)

Charles D. Wright

The Sources of the Pembroke 25 Homiliary

Thomas N. Hall

New Manuscript Witnesses to the Homiliary of Angers

Aidan Conti, Stephen Pelle, and Winfried Rudolf

The Lenten Tithe of Days: An Old English Theme and Its Treatment and Sources in Three Anonymous Homilies (Irvine V, Napier LV, and Blickling III)

Robert Getz

A New Analogue for Some Exegetical Motifs in Assmann Homily XIII

Esther Lemmerz

The Sources and Composition of Two Old English Sunday Letter Homilies

Stephen Pelle

Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* in Anglo-Saxon England: A New Source for an Old English Homily (Irvine VII) in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343

Thijs Porck

Jews and Judaizing as Pathologies in the Anglo-Saxon Imagination: Toward a Theory of Early Somatic Anti-Judaism

Samantha Zacher

The Pains and Pleasures of Vercelli Homily IX and the Delights of Textual Transmission

Jonathan Wilcox

The Resonances and Roles of Vercelli Homily X in Multiple Manuscripts

Robert K. Upchurch

Bibliography

Indexes

L1 Introduction

Winfried Rudolf and Susan Irvine

Anonymous homilies represent about one fifth of all surviving text written in Old English.[1] They form a major part of the largest surviving preaching corpus in a European vernacular before the year 1200 A.D. Preached to audiences of all social strata, they offer deep insights into the restricted education granted to barely literate Anglo-Saxons by the ecclesiastical elite. Perhaps more than any other genre of Old English literature they are therefore key to understanding what moved the hearts and minds of early English Christians and which ideas shaped their worldview. Indebted to a wide range of European sources from previous centuries, these texts catalyse basic tenets of Continental Christianity, showing to what extent these were adapted in order to function in English contexts both pre- and post-Conquest. Old English anonymous homilies also identify both

[1] We do not distinguish between homily and sermon in their stricter senses throughout this volume, because the distinction seems to have had little to no relevance to early English preachers. "Homily" will be used in a holistic sense, comprising both homilies and sermons in their narrower senses as texts of catechesis and exegesis. On this problem see for example Jean Longère, *La prédication médiévale* (Paris, 1983), pp. 26–27; Mary Clayton, "Homiliaries and Preaching in Anglo-Saxon England," *Peritia* 4 (1985), 207–42; and Hildegard L. C. Tristram, *Early Insular Preaching: Verbal Artistry and Method of Composition*, Sitzungsberichte: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 623, Veröffentlichungen der Keltischen Kommission 11 (Vienna, 1995), p. 3. On the Old English and Anglo-Latin terminology for homiliaries see Helmut Gneuss, "Liturgical Books in Anglo-Saxon England and Their Old English Terminology," in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 122–24.

crucial and debatable narratives, norms, and values in the making of Western Christianity, some of which survive and are still formative of cultures of the West today. They witness most directly the processes of making and shaping of a religious belief.

More than three hundred and fifty manuscript versions of anonymous homilies in Old English survive in about sixty manuscripts where they can occur as single items or in groups in the company of Christian poetry, monastic or secular regulations, penitentials, prognostics, the Gospels in the vernacular, or pontifical texts.[2] In other cases they supplement collections of homilies by Ælfric of Eynsham (d. ca. 1010 A.D.) or Wulfstan of York (d. 1023 A.D.). The authorship of both these famed Old English homilists—even if occasionally doubtful[3]—has attracted significantly more attention to their works than

---

[2] See for example MSS CCCC 140 and 201; London, BL, Cotton Tiberius A. iii; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121; Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII (The Vercelli Book).

[3] In particular Wulfstan's authorship and the size of his canon of writings has been controversially debated by Angus McIntosh, "Wulfstan's Prose," *PBA* 35 (1949), 109–42; Karl Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten 23 (Berne, 1950); Dorothy Bethurum, ed., *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford, 1957); Jonathan Wilcox, "The Wolf on Shepherds: Wulfstan, Bishops, and the Context of the *Sermo Lupi Ad Anglos*," in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 5 (New York, 2000), pp. 395–418; Patrick Wormald, "Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State-Builder," in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. Matthew Townend, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 10 (Turnhout, 2004), pp. 9–28 and others. It is commonly accepted that later homilists drew on the works of both Ælfric and Wulfstan, who were themselves creative compilers and rewriters; see further Joyce Hill, "Ælfric, Authorial Identity and the Changing Text," in *The Editing of Old English: Papers from the 1990 Manchester Conference*, ed. Donald G. Scragg and Paul E. Szarmach (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 177–90; Mary Swan, "Old English Made New: One Catholic Homily and Its Reuses," *LSE* n.s. 28 (1997), 1–18 and her "Ælfric's Catholic Homilies in the Twelfth Century," in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne, CSASE 30 (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 62–82; Andy Orchard, "Wulfstan as Reader, Writer, and Rewriter," in

granted to the rest of Old English preaching texts and has generated consistent academic response for at least the past five decades.[4] Both authors have secured a safe place in the canon of Old English literature today, although they remain much less popular in current curricula than the Old English poetic corpus and some of the classics of Alfredian prose. Anonymous homilies, instead, are rarely taught at universities today and therefore remain outside the focus of most scholars of Old English literature, who often prefer to investigate what they know better. However, the past two decades have seen a gradually growing engagement with the Old English anonymous homily, not least due to their socio-historical importance, but even more so in the wake of important new discoveries, such as the Taunton Fragments or the Digby 63 palimpsest, hidden poetic traces or hitherto unknown Latin sources.[5] Nevertheless, essential aspects of the textuality of the Old English

---

The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation, ed. Aaron J. Kleist, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17 (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 311–41. For the argument to consider only autograph Wulfstan as original Wulfstan see Winfried Rudolf, "Wulfstan at Work: Recovering the Autographs of London, British Library, Additional 38651, fols. 57r–58v," in *Anglo-Saxon Micro-Texts*, ed. Ursula Lenker and Lucia Kornexl, Anglia Book Series 67 (Berlin, 2019), pp. 267–306.

[4] See *CH* I and *CH* II, as well as Bethurum, *Homilies of Wulfstan* and the companion collections to these authors edited by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, eds., *A Companion to Ælfric*, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 18 (Leiden, 2009) and Matthew Townend, ed., *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York* (see n. 3).

[5] Charles D. Wright, "More Old English Poetry in Vercelli Homily XXI," in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. Elaine M. Treharne and Susan Rosser, MRTS 252 (Tempe, AZ, 2002), pp. 245–62; Mechthild Gretsch, "The Taunton Fragment: A New Text from Anglo-Saxon England," *ASE* 33 (2004), 145–93; Stephen Pelle, "The Seven Pains of Hell: The Latin Source of an Old English Homiletic Motif," *RES* n.s. 62 (2011), 167–80; Donald G. Scragg, "A Ninth-Century Old English Homily from Northumbria," *ASE* 45 (2017), 39–49, and Winfried Rudolf, "The Earliest Surviving Homily in English," *N&Q* n.s. 66 (2019), 24–26.

anonymous homily, its sources, compositional methods, and variation, and, as a consequence, its editing, remain misunderstood. This collection of essays aims to stimulate and encourage the study of the anonymous preaching corpus of early medieval England and its European source tradition, thus promoting the recently established Electronic Corpus of Anonymous Homilies in Old English Project (ECHOE) a new initiative at Göttingen University—initially established with the Anneliese Maier Forschungspreis of the Alexander von Humboldt-Foundation for Professor Susan E. Irvine, and now funded by a Consolidator Grant of the European Research Council for Professor Winfried Rudolf—which will unite all surviving homilies and their Latin sources in an interactive online corpus that will give full credit to their textual variance and interdependence.[6]

L2 The Textuality of the Old English Anonymous Homily

The main distinctive feature of the anonymous homily is its textual fluidity in variation and recompilation, a feature which properly defines it as a genre of frequent use and reuse. Its nature as an unstable multiform text, consisting of a variety of participating manuscript versions and their revisional layers, is unmatched by most other early medieval literary genres of Europe. One reason for this complexity of the anonymous homily is the eclectic method of its composition: the majority of the surviving unauthored Old English preaching addresses was composed from a vast variety of canonical and deutero-canonical Latin sources, most of which originated in different parts of Europe. These source texts communicated a wide range of religious, political, and literary ideas to England and were sometimes already composite texts themselves, while others were only selectively

[6] This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 772744.

translated for vernacular compilation.[7] Legitimised and taught to Anglo-Saxon scholars by Augustine's *De doctrina christiana*, this creative method of text-composition was popular and far-reaching.[8] Canonical preaching sources such as the works of the Church Fathers and of important teachers such as Caesarius of Arles, Eusebius Gallicanus, John Chrysostom or Isidore of Seville represent a well-known textual quarry for Old English homilists.[9] Lesser known authors, however, such as Atto of Vercelli and Gezo of Tortona or anonymous collections such as the *Cathechesis Celtica*, the redactions of the *Visio Pauli*, the sermons of Pseudo-Augustine, Pseudo-Jerome or the anonymous homiliary of St-Père de Chartres have received only little attention by scholars so far.[10] This collection

[7] Donald G. Scragg, "Anonymous Old English Homilies," in *SASLC*: *A Trial Version*, pp. 124–30; Thomas N. Hall, "Latin Sermons for Saints in Early English Homiliaries and Legendaries," in *The Old English Homily*, ed. Kleist, pp. 227–64; Charles D. Wright, "Old English Homilies and Latin Sources," in *The Old English Homily*, ed. Kleist, pp. 15–66.

[8] Tristram, *Early Insular Preaching*, p. 28; Otis C. Edwards, *A History of Preaching*, 2 vols. (Nashville, TN, 2004), 1:147; Michael Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford, 2006), p. 199 and passim.

[9] See for example Paul E. Szarmach, "Caesarius of Arles and the *Vercelli Homilies*," *Traditio* 26 (1970), 315–23; Samantha Zacher, "The Source of Vercelli VII: An Address to Women," in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, TASS 4 (Toronto, 2009), pp. 98–149.

[10] Antonette diPaolo Healey, ed., *The Old English Vision of St. Paul*, Speculum Anniversary Monographs 2 (Cambridge, MA, 1978); James E. Cross, ed., *Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25: A Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, KCLMS 1 (London, 1987) and his James E. Cross, "Atto of Vercelli, 'De pressuris ecclesiasticis' Archbishop Wulfstan and Wulfstan's 'Commonplace Book,'" *Traditio* 48 (1993), 237–46; Helen L. Spencer, "Vernacular and Latin Versions of a Sermon for Lent: 'A Lost Penitential Homily' Found," *MS* 44 (1982), 271–305; Charles D. Wright, *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*, CSASE 6 (Cambridge, 1993) and his "*The Apocalypse of Thomas*: Some New Latin Texts and Their Significance for the Old English Versions," in *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon*

of essays adds some important new discoveries to the source catalogue of Old English anonymous homilies, reminding us that basic research on the textual influences is essential before a profound assessment of the idiosyncrasies of vernacular witnesses can begin.

Whenever a new source of an Old English anonymous homily is identified, the study of it is further complicated by varying degrees of closeness to the vernacular text, often traceable only through comparisons of specific redactions in original manuscripts.[11] It is, however, crucial to recognise the earliest as well as the textually closest manuscript witnesses in order to reconstruct with more certainty the potential lines, chronologies, and topographies of homiletic transmission between and within different regions of Europe and early medieval England. Only then can scholars begin to address fundamental questions, such as whether the compilation of a version preceded the translation into Old English or not, which of multiple Old English versions stands closest to a specific Latin redaction, or to what extent the recompilation of Old English versions entailed comprehensive variation or adaptation of homiletic material, both from Old English and from Latin.[12]

England, ed. Kathryn Powell and Donald G. Scragg, MANCASS 2 (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 27–64; Brandon Hawk, *Preaching Apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England* (Toronto, 2018).

[11] See for example Charles D. Wright, "A Doomsday Passage in an Old English Homily for Lent, Revisited," *Anglia* 128 (2010), 28–47 and his "A New Latin Source for Two Old English Homilies (Fadda I and Blickling I): Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* App. 125, and the Ideology of Chastity in the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine Reform," in *Source of Wisdom: Old English and Early Medieval Latin Studies in Honour of Thomas D. Hill*, ed. Charles D. Wright, Frederick M. Biggs, and Thomas N. Hall, Toronto Old English Series 16 (Toronto, 2007), pp. 239–65; Winfried Rudolf, "An Early Manuscript Witness of the Homiliaries of Angers and St. Père de Chartres in Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, MS Msc.Bibl.30a," *JML* 27 (2017), 1–40.

[12] See for example Arthur S. Napier's discussion of the anonymous homily on Saint Chad and its relation to Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* in its bilingual transmission in his "Ein altenglisches Leben des heiligen Chad," *Anglia* 10 (1888), 131–56.

Breaking some new ground, the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici Project* has provided source identifications for about fifty per cent of the anonymous homilies,[13] but its entries cite only the opening and closing tags of source passages from critical, sometimes outdated, editions, and they list the various original sources rather than considering potential composite intermediary Latin versions, closer to the Old English, which could have been available to vernacular homilists in some cases.[14] That intensive manuscript research can indeed bring such close redactions to light has been demonstrated more than once by Charles D. Wright, while others have drawn special attention to the anonymous collections of St-Père and Angers and suggest that these and other anonymous Continental collections promise new discoveries of source material.[15] Both these Continental preaching collections receive ample attention in essays of this book.

In a few instances the Old English versions testify to the knowledge of Latin works that cannot be identified among the surviving manuscripts from early England,[16] in others they may even represent the only remaining witnesses of some idiosyncratic theological doctrine of earlier centuries whose Latin sources may perhaps be lost forever. All this demonstrates that the Old English anonymous homily possesses several source layers, many of which have never been fully charted, let alone carefully studied. This volume

---

[13] This estimate relates to the fifty-four homilies and their parallel versions; see *Fontes*.

[14] As outlined by Joyce Hill with regard to Ælfric in her "Authority and Intertextuality in the Works of Ælfric," in *PBA: 2004 Lectures*, ed. P. J. Marshall, *PBA* 131 (Oxford, 2005), pp. 157–82.

[15] See, among other contributions, his "A New Latin Source," or "*The Apocalypse of Thomas*: Some New Latin Texts," pp. 27–64.

[16] See for example the identifications of texts by John Chrysostom and Gregory of Tours by Winfried Rudolf, "The Source and Textual Identity of 'Homily' Napier XXXI: Ælfric and the *Munuccild* of Saint-Maurice d'Agaune," *RES* n.s. 57, no. 232 (2006), 607–22 and Zacher, "The Source of Vercelli VII."

offers some important new evidence in this regard, hoping to elucidate the instrumental role of source studies for the understanding of vernacular compositions.

Much understudied, too, are the bilingual aspects of Old English anonymous homilies proper, which contain valuable hints about their sources, their original composition, and performance.[17] Some Old English versions are accompanied by their direct Latin source in the manuscripts, others contain Latin paratext or sporadic Latin quotations, mostly, but not exclusively, drawn from the Bible.[18] Exceptionally rare manuscript evidence comes from the Taunton Fragments, discovered only in 2004, where Old English and Latin alternate in a sentence by sentence translation of material from the Homiliary of Angers,[19] or from Vercelli XVI, which contains a few alternating sentences

[17] For an overview of Anglo-Latin bilingualism see Rosalind Love, "Anglo-Latin Literature in the Foreground," in *"Books Most Needful to Know": Contexts for the Study of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, Old English Newsletter Subsidia 36 (Kalamazoo, MI, 2016), pp. 1–59 and also Olga Timofeeva, "Anglo-Latin Bilingualism before 1066: Prospects and Limitations," in *Interfaces between Language and Culture in Medieval England: A Festschrift for Matti Kilpiö*, ed. Alaric Hall et al., The Northern World 48 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 1–36. On the literary production of Anglo-Saxons across the language divide see especially the seminal publications by Michael Lapidge, *Anglo-Latin Literature*, 2 vols. (London, 1993) and Andy Orchard, "Latin and the Vernacular Languages: The Creation of a Bilingual Textual Culture," in *After Rome*, ed. Thomas M. Charles-Edwards, The Short Oxford History of the British Isles (Oxford, 2003), pp. 191–219.

[18] For a case study see Winfried Rudolf, "Quoting and Translating Latin in the Old English Homilies of the Vercelli Book," in *The Pragmatics of Quoting Now and Then*, ed. Jenny Arendholz, Wolfram Bublitz, and Monika Kirner-Ludwig, Topics in English Linguistics 89 (Berlin, 2015), pp. 271–90. A full study of all Latin quotations in Old English anonymous homilies is currently being undertaken by Esther M. Lemmerz at Göttingen University.

[19] Gretsch, "The Taunton Fragment," and Aidan Keally Conti, "The Taunton Fragment and the Homiliary of Angers: Context for New Old English," *RES* n.s. 60, no. 243 (2009), 1–33.

from a rare pericope at its beginning.[20] The study of the bilingual aspects of Old English homilies and their variation produces new evidence for the reconstruction of translational processes and the identification of changing audiences in changing liturgical contexts.[21]

Another source layer surfaces in those homilies made up largely of passages drawn from a variety of other pre-existing Old English homilies, but also other vernacular writings, and not freshly composed or translated from Latin. This creative method of composition of Old English anonymous homilies from flexible textual units often entails a synthesis of various textual genres, which has frequently led to the misconception that these texts are an unmethodical amalgamation of literary styles. Combining law code, letter, and litany with penitential, poem, and prayer, exemplum and encyclopaedic lists with dramatic dialogues and doxologies, Old English homilies follow, but also extend, the models of Carolingian and post-Carolingian preaching through their own compositional strategies and richness of topic and tone.[22] This fascinating fusion of textual segments,

---

[20] Thomas N. Hall, "The Reversal of the Jordan in Vercelli Homily 16 and in Old English Literature," *Traditio* 45 (1989/90), 53–86 and Rudolf, "Quoting and Translating Latin."

[21] Vercelli XVIII, for example, contains no sign of any use of Latin and may have deliberately excluded it. Its missing middle part is nonetheless emended by Scragg from Blickling XVII thus including this version's Latin quotations (see *VH*, pp. 297–308).

[22] On the use of the various genres see, among others, Douglas R. Letson, "The Poetic Content of the Revival Homily," in *The Old English Homily and Its Backgrounds*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach and Bernard Felix Huppé (Albany, NY, 1978), pp. 139–56; Clare A. Lees, "The 'Sunday Letter' and the 'Sunday Lists,'" *ASE* 14 (1985), 129–51; Patrick Wormald, *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century.* Vol. 1: *Legislation and Its Limits* (Maiden, MA, 1999), p. 197 ff.; Graham D. Caie, ed., *The Old English Poem* Judgement Day II*: A Critical Edition with Editions of* De die iudicii *and the Hatton 113 Homily* Be domes dæge, Anglo-Saxon Texts 2 (Cambridge, 2000) and M. Bradford Bedingfield, *The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 1 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2002).

which are not always drawn from canonical material, contributes to no small extent to the literary quality and complexity of these addresses. Erratic as these homilies may seem at first glance, they often rely on a thoughtful rhetorical build-up[23] and reveal compositional strategies that seek to engage and persuade their audiences through a mixture of rhetorical styles, between prose and poetry, between plain instruction and memorable elocution, ensuring the *delectare* as well as the *prodesse* of the text in oral delivery as well as private *lectio*.[24] In fact, vernacular homilies belong to the few literary areas in which early English authors could exercise a kind of stylistic artistry in dynamic re-compilation and adaptation that would surpass that of the act of "classical" translation from the Latin.[25] The textual identities of homilies are therefore not only blurred by multiple co-existing versions, the community of which as a whole constitutes the actual "multiform text," but also by changing material demarcations, by generic and stylistic versatility, and by theological,

[23] On this topic see especially Paul E. Szarmach, "The Vercelli Homilies. Style and Structure," in *The Old English Homily and Its Backgrounds*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach and Bernard Felix Huppé (Albany, 1978), pp. 139–155 and Thomas L. Amos, "Early Medieval Sermons and Their Audience," in *De l'homélie au sermon: Histoire de la prédication médiévale*, ed. Jacqueline Hamesse and Xavier Hermand, Publications de l'institut d'études mediévales 14 (Louvain-La-Neuve, 1993), pp. 1–14.

[24] Eric Gerald Stanley, "*The Judgement of the Damned* (from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201 and Other Manuscripts), and the Definition of Old English Verse," in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Lapidge and Gneuss, pp. 363–91; Tristram, *Early Insular Preaching*, p. 25; Winfried Rudolf, "Journey to the Borderland: Two Poetic Passages on Judgement Day in Old English Homilies Revisited," in *Proceedings of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies Postgraduate Conference*, vol. 1 (Manchester, 2005), pp. 1–13; Charles D. Wright, "Vercelli Homilies XI–XIII and the Benedictine Reform: Tailored Sources and Implied Audiences," in *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages*, ed. Carolyn Muessig (Leiden, 2002), pp. 203–27, and Zacher, "The Source of Vercelli VII," p. 106 ff.

[25] Tristram, *Early Insular Preaching*, pp. 13–15.

political and rhetorical adaptation. Mapping this maze of shifting identities within a vast interversional network of anonymous homilies, while honouring the fascinating singularities of each unique manuscript version, is a challenge to which some contributions in this book are giving in-depth answers in the form of case-studies.

L2 The Editorial Dilemma

The dynamic and fluid textuality of the vernacular homiletic genre, a genre which attempts to explain the timeless truth of the word of God and the doctrine of His church in an inevitably changing world, must—almost by necessity—stand in conflict with traditional methods of "classical" textual criticism. These methods favour the reconstruction of idealised (ur)texts and main authoritative versions that create the illusion of an absolute text (*Sprachdenkmal*) that is static, hermetic, and timeless.[26] This involves the definition, identification, and eradication or emendation of "errors," the collation of multiple textual states into maximised "ideal versions," and the degradation or suppression of meaningful variants and diachronic revisions into critical apparatuses and notes (which are rarely studied).[27] This type of hierarchical textual criticism may have worked well with many

[26] On this problem see, among others, Clare A. Lees, "Whose Text Is It Anyway? Contexts for Editing Old English Prose," in *The Editing of Old English*, ed. Scragg and Szarmach, pp. 97–114; Seth Lerer, *Error and the Academic Self: The Scholarly Imagination, Medieval to Modern* (New York, 2002), p. 55, and Susan Irvine, "Linguistic Peculiarities in Late Copies of Ælfric and their Editorial Implications," in *Essays on Anglo-Saxon and Related Themes in Memory of Dr Lynne Grundy*, ed. J. Roberts and J. Nelson, KCLMS 17 (London, 2000), pp. 237–57.

[27] On the issue see also Winfried Rudolf, "The Editing of Old English: A Plea for Including Manuscript Facsimiles," in *Mittelalterphilologien heute. Eine Standortbestimmung, Vol. 1*, *Die germanischen Philologien*, ed. Alessandra Molinari (Würzburg, 2017), pp. 173–186.

Latin texts of the Middle Ages, whose relative regularity in wording, grammar, and orthography was the result of a long tradition of analytical codification as well as a tribute to the elevated status of a holy language. It may even have produced some valuable results for particular vernacular genres codified only much later, such as Old English poetry that is rarely preserved in more than one, usually unrevised, manuscript version. For Old English anonymous homilies, however, this approach has proved to be inappropriate.[28]

In the footsteps of critical editing, most of the available printed editions of the past almost two hundred years have misunderstood the nature of the Old English anonymous homily—namely that it is a dynamic multiform text. Their subconscious struggle with the complex identity of the homiletic text is already evident in their inconsistent taxonomy, which complicates the access to single versions, hampers a more holistic understanding of the homiletic tradition, and continues to obstruct a sustained scholarly debate. While some homilies have been named after and edited under their manuscript shelfmarks (Blickling, Vercelli), others carry the designation of their first or most recent editors (e.g. Bazire-Cross, Fadda, Irvine, Napier, Schaefer, or Tristram), or can only be identified by means of their less than informative *Dictionary of Old English* short title (e.g. HomM 9, HomS 2 or HomU 27).[29] These inconsistencies of nomenclature are a major reason for the serious

[28] It is therefore problematic to proclaim a single editorial standard as panacea, regardless of the specific genre of an Old English text, as for example implied by Michael Lapidge, "Textual Criticism and the Literature of Anglo-Saxon England," in *Textual Criticism and Material Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Thomas Northcote Toller and the Toller Memorial Lectures*, ed. Donald G. Scragg (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 107–36, or Helmut Gneuss, "Guide to the Editing and Preparation of Texts for the Dictionary of Old English," in *The Editing of Old English*, ed. Scragg and Szarmach (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 7–26.

[29] For the Blickling Homilies, formerly kept at Blickling Hall, Norfolk, see Princeton, University Library, Scheide 71. For the system of short titles (also used for reference throughout this volume) see Roberta Frank

neglect of some of the most intriguing anonymous pieces in the corpus, and such neglect urgently calls for a standardised classification of homiletic versions, accompanied by a holistic intertextual edition. Preliminary steps to tackle the issue of nomenclature were undertaken by Janet Bately, but her survey cannot, nor does it, make a claim for completeness.[30]

Some of our current standard editions date to the nineteenth century, and many editions of only a single or very few homilies are scattered over various articles in journals or unpublished PhD dissertations. Several individual versions of homilies are available only as transcripts in the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus*, others are still awaiting their first edition. Almost all available editions either collate variants to produce idealised versions, estranged from their manuscript realities, or they edit individual homilies isolated from their community of textual parallels,[31] their sources, and their manuscript context.[32] This extremely disjointed and idiosyncratic body of textual representations in print stands in stark contrast to the interdependence of Old English homiletic texts, which form a complex and dynamic network of related versions with varying degrees of correspondence in theme and style. Exploring the depths of this network was hitherto almost impossible,

---

and Angus Cameron, eds., *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*, Toronto Old English Series 2 (Toronto, 1973).

[30] Janet Bately, *Anonymous Old English Homilies: A Preliminary Bibliography of Source Studies*, Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies (Binghamton, NY, 1993), p. ii.

[31] An admirable exception is Scragg's 1992 edition (*VH*) of the Vercelli Homilies, in which he prints related Old English versions and their textual units, but the comparison is not holistic, due to the practical constraints of the print medium.

[32] Some consign variants of several hundred words into the apparatuses. See for example Napier XXIII.

and it is exactly this deficit that the Electronic Corpus of Anonymous Homilies in Old English (ECHOE) at Göttingen University, will attempt to rectify.

L2 Introducing the ECHOE Project

ECHOE will unite for the first time all surviving anonymous and Wulfstanian homilies[33] in an online and interactive digital corpus that will do justice to each individual manuscript version with its decisive palaeographical and paratextual features, its sources and compositional structure, and its textual variants and multiple layers of revision added before 1200 A.D. Building on the theoretical concept of *mouvance*, which describes the principles of strophic variation in poetry,[34] this corpus will identify popular thematic units in the wide network of interrelated versions of the corpus and trace their dependence on various Latin sources as well as their mobility during composition and recompilation. It will also celebrate the essential textual *variance* of homilies by marking up substantial differences between parallel (parts of) manuscript versions and the revisions of individual homilists both within and across manuscripts.[35] However, the ECHOE project will not only simply record this textual variance whenever it occurs, but will also provide the necessary tools for analysing and systematising compositional, variational, and revisional strategies of homilists. In doing so it counters traditional models of editing by reversing the conformist approach of critical collations, thus recovering and exposing valuable text-

[33] Homilies by Ælfric of Eynsham will be excluded, because they are available in major critical editions although not all of their manuscript redactions are adequately represented. However, ECHOE will include versions that combine parts of Ælfric's homilies with anonymous material. It will also include hagiographical texts that have demonstrably been tailored into homiletic addresses.

[34] Paul Zumthor, *Essai de poétique médiévale* (Paris, 1972).

[35] Bernard Cerquiglini, *Éloge de la variante: histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris, 1989).

variational data that is usually suppressed or neglected by the policies of modern printed editions. The approach of ECHOE aims to overcome the material limits of the print medium through new forms of text display, comparison, and analysis that allow a holistic understanding of any manuscript version of an Old English homily in its manifold textual relations within the Old English corpus as well as with its Latin sources. ECHOE aims to serve as a prototype for future bilingual editions of creative multiform texts that seek to include palaeographical data which is all too often ironed out by the print medium.

Another innovation of the corpus is its inclusion of all identifiable Latin source texts and, whenever possible, their redactions closest to a vernacular version. This will facilitate the understanding of the composite structure of Old English homilies, which emerged either before or after translation. Importantly, ECHOE will allow users for the first time to compare Old English anonymous homilies to their Latin sources, sentence by sentence, and thus enable unprecedented discoveries on translation, adaptation, and style across the language divide. It will also highlight Latin versions that accompany their Old English translations in manuscripts and will mark up and analyse all of the ca. 1100 shorter Latin quotations surviving in the Old English versions. The entire data will not only reconstruct the "preaching library" of early medieval England, including hitherto unrecorded works, but will also indicate the bilingual expertise of preachers and their audiences, the most popular and essential sources preached to the Anglo-Saxon laity, and the impact of Latin rhetoric on various preaching styles. ECHOE will also answer such questions as to what extent compilers and redactors observed the authority of their sources, how these sources reached them, and which sources needed to be censored over time.

L2 This Volume's Contributions

The implementation of ECHOE and its new analytical functions is based on profound fieldwork of the kind of the contributions assembled in this volume. The essays all contribute to the key themes of sources, composition, and variation in anonymous Old English homilies. Following on from this introduction by the editors, the volume begins with an overview by Donald Scragg of the major issues that arise in any attempt to establish the corpus of Old English anonymous homilies. Drawing on examples from a range of manuscripts including the Vercelli Book, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115, CCCC 162, and CCCC 303, the essay engages with crucial questions such as where to draw the line between an "authored" homily and an anonymous one, and what differentiates two homilies and two versions of the same homily.

The remainder of the essays are divided loosely into three groups according to the themes of the volume. The first group addresses the topic of source study: the essays consider respectively the early development of the study of sources for anonymous Old English homilies, and two Latin homiliaries that offer important evidence about the kind of source material available to the vernacular homilists of early medieval England. Charles Wright's essay, "Sourcing Old English Anonymous Homilies: The Pioneers (Max Förster, Rudolph Willard, and J. E. Cross)," presents a historiography of source scholarship on Old English anonymous homilies, focusing on the work of three eminent academics. Wright shows just how much we owe to these scholars for their magisterial contributions to the knowledge of the Latin sources of Old English anonymous homilies. Wright offers a salutary reminder that source scholarship remains, and probably always will remain, a work-in-progress, and sees particular room for development in the analysis of the implications of source studies for textual criticism, lexicography, stylistics and translation studies, and for cultural and intellectual history.

Thomas N. Hall's essay on "The Sources of the Pembroke 25 Homiliary" offers a full overview of the homiliary in Cambridge, Pembroke College 25, a late eleventh-century manuscript from Bury St Edmunds, which comprises a version of a Carolingian collection known as the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres. The manuscript, as Hall shows, is crucial to the study of Old English anonymous homilies because it contains such a wealth of source material available to their authors. The essay presents a survey of all surviving manuscripts of the Saint-Père Homiliary, and examines both its relationship with surviving vernacular homilies and the known sources of the collection. A fresh inventory of the manuscript's contents is supplied in an appendix to the essay.

In their essay, "New Manuscript Witnesses to the Homiliary of Angers," Aidan Conti, Stephen Pelle, and Winfried Rudolf discuss four hitherto unknown manuscript witnesses to another Latin source for the anonymous homiletic tradition in early medieval England, known as the Homiliary of Angers. The new manuscript evidence—respectively in Angers, BM 55, Épinal, BM 161, Orléans, BM 179, and Paris, BnF, lat. 13768—is described and assessed by the authors, and its implications for the Homiliary's date (probably before the last third of the ninth century), possible transmission to England, and its popularity as a collection, are explored.

The second group of essays addresses the topic of homiletic composition, with each of the four essays identifying new sources or analogues that can be seen to advance our knowledge of how particular Old English anonymous homilies were composed. Robert Getz, in "The Lenten Tithe of Days: An Old English Theme and its Treatment and Sources in Three Anonymous Homilies (Irvine V, Napier LV, and Blickling III)," focuses on the Old English homiletic treatment of Cassian's notion that the thirty-six days of penance remaining in Lent after its first Sunday constitute a tenth, or tithe, of the days of the year, which can, if spent in fasting and other penitential acts, be offered to God as a tithe

comparable to the tithe of agricultural produce prescribed in the Mosaic law. Getz accepts, with other scholars, that Gregory the Great's *Homilia* 16 *in Evangelia* serves as an ultimate source for this motif in all three of the anonymous homilies that include it. He argues, however, that the passages in Irvine and Napier, which descend from a common Old English source, are evidently drawing on the treatment of this topic in Isidore of Seville's *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (itself an adaptation of Cassian's explanation of the tithe of days). In the case of Blickling III, he suggests that comparison with Isidore's Latin allows sense to be made of a highly problematic sentence in this homily, perhaps resulting from revision of an original text that followed Isidore closely.

In "A New Analogue for Some Exegetical Motifs in Assmann Homily XIII," Esther Lemmerz argues that the anonymous Old English homily Assmann XIII shares several exegetical motifs and some direct verbal correspondences with *Sermo* 29 in Pembroke College 25 (and its corresponding *Sermo* 17, in the *Catechesis Celtica*), cautiously concluding that the Assmann XIII homilist was perhaps familiar with a text like this one. On the basis of her analysis of the manuscript evidence she suggests that Assmann XIII is more likely to be connected to the Pembroke Homiliary than to the *Catechesis Celtica*.

Stephen Pelle, in his essay "The Sources and Composition of Two Old English Sunday Letter Homilies," identifies two new Latin manuscripts as sources for two Old English Sunday Letter homilies (*DOE* short titles HomU 46 and HomU 53). Versions of the so-called Sunday Letter, a missive purportedly sent to earth by Christ in order to encourage the proper observance of the Lord's Day, were the principal sources for at least seven anonymous Old English homilies, six of which survive. Building on the work of Dorothy Haines, who identified two Latin manuscripts representing a new and distinctive recension of the Latin Sunday Letter (Recension IIA) that evidently lies behind two

previously unsourced Old English homilies. Pelle shows that some peculiarities of the Old English texts, which are not paralleled by the Latin manuscripts uncovered by Haines, can in fact be explained by two further manuscripts of this recension, both of which are of English origin and contain many readings that agree with the Old English homilies against the previously-known Recension IIA texts. Pelle's discovery of these texts demonstrates the importance of in-depth manuscript study—as opposed to reliance on published editions—in the source analysis of Old English homilies. The essay also addresses the relevance of the two new Recension IIA manuscripts to a late Middle English Sunday Letter sermon, and elucidates several hitherto overlooked lines of embedded poetry in HomU 46.

In his essay "Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* in Anglo-Saxon England: A New Source for an Old English Homily (Irvine Homily VII) in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343," Thijs Porck demonstrates that Irvine VII features a paraphrase of over sixty lines of the poem *De mundi transitu* by Columbanus (d. 616 A.D.). Reading both texts side by side also reveals some scribal corruptions in the extant versions of both texts. The link provides evidence for the first time that Columbanus's poem circulated in early medieval England. Porck also calls attention to a hitherto unnoticed quotation of *De mundi transitu* in Sedulius Scottus's *Collectaneum miscellaneum*, as well as to Columbanus's use of Pseudo-Basil's *De admonitio ad filium spiritualem* as a source.

The third and final group of essays addresses the topic of variation: here the authors analyse and interpret the significance of variations that may occur across two or more versions of a homily. The first of the group focuses on the implications of very different geographical and historical contexts of a homily and its source; the other two essays each examine variations across multiple manuscript versions of a particular anonymous Old English homily.

Samantha Zacher's essay, "Jews and Judaizing as Pathologies in the Anglo-Saxon Imagination: Toward a Theory of Early Somatic Anti-Judaism," builds on Zacher's earlier identification of the source for Vercelli VII as a Latin translation of John Chrysostom's homily 29 *In epistulam ad Hebraeos*. Here she discusses the homily's trope of anti-Judaism, seen in the way that the homily's weak and self-indulgent women are compared to gluttonous and idolatrous Jews. While the homilists allow that women may, with hard work, sublimate or transcend their own fleshly condition, they do not imagine a similar conversionary process for the Jews. Whereas previous studies have suggested that Vercelli VII represents an early instantiation of medieval anti-Semitism, since it focuses atypically on Jewish bodily corruption and contagion, Zacher argues that the homily must be read in its original historical context. In the hands of the Vercelli homilist, Zacher suggests, Chrysostom's virulent anti-Jewish stereotypes are transferred into a context in which they become complete idealizations, since the geographical and historical context of early medieval England is entirely devoid of real existing Jews. Building outwards from Vercelli VII to look at the Old English and Anglo-Latin homiletic tradition at large, Zacher constructs an argument that the intellectual problem of "Judaizing" is essential to understanding the presence of anti-Judaic invective in the period as a whole.

In "The Pains and Pleasures of Vercelli Homily IX and the Delights of Textual Transmission," Jonathan Wilcox explores the implications of variations in the multiple manuscript versions of Vercelli IX. Focusing on passages describing heaven and hell, he asks whether a homiletic motif could be used in such an extended and exaggerated way that an audience might react to it as funny. The variations in passages exploiting the motifs of the inexpressible torments of hell and the pleasures of heaven show that some preachers may have appreciated the humorous potential of these motifs, while others may have been more squeamish.

The final essay in the volume is Robert K. Upchurch's analysis of "The Resonances and Roles of Vercelli Homily X in Multiple Manuscript Contexts." The essay focuses on four copies of Vercelli X in three different manuscripts to draw attention to the distinctive resonances the homily might generate within particular socio-historical contexts, specifically when preached in the field by a low-status priest (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 85/86), at a minster by a high-status priest (the two different versions in CCCC 302), and at Exeter Cathedral by Bishop Leofric (CCCC 419 and 421). The work of the Electronic Corpus of Anonymous Old English Homilies (ECHOE) will, Upchurch concludes, be invaluable in identifying and tracing the kinds of verbal and thematic resonances that may help to clarify further the circumstances of reception and delivery of individual manuscript versions of anonymous Old English homilies.

The range of evidence presented here offers various points of departure for fresh and unprecedented research into the anonymous homiletic corpus at a time of a notable decline of philological acumen in the field of early English. Some of the ideas and discoveries gathered here, provocative and confounding as they may be, will hopefully invite reconsiderations and new responses to some old and not so old questions relating to the field of homiletics and beyond. As means of instruction and indoctrination of peripheral, non-élite audiences, medieval homilies have much to tell about ideological fictions, irrational fear-mongering, and reckless rhetorical manipulation. They may therefore hold more enlightening analogues on phenomena in our present day and age than many readers would wish to discover. The ECHOE project will provide a unique gateway into this fascinating textual genre, hoping to encourage scholars to produce more innovative research in the field, such as the essays gathered in this book.

L1 The Corpus of Old English Anonymous Homilies

Donald G. Scragg

Before beginning any new project, it is necessary to define the terms denoting its scope, and in the case of the project under discussion in this book, the key word requiring analysis is plainly "anonymous." However other terms are problematic too. For example, where do we draw the line between a homily and a saint's life?[1] Clearly Ælfric did not do so in his First and Second Series, and nor did the Vercelli scribe before him (in Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII), although some later scribes, such as the compiler of the collection in CCCC 162, did.[2] One might even ask, why limit the project to what we nowadays consider Old English prose as against verse, as clearly the Vercelli scribe did not distinguish between the two given that his collection includes homilies and saints' lives in both prose and verse, while we have homilies which are predominantly prose but which include passages which are capable of being scanned as verse, e.g. Vercelli II, X, and XXI, though they lack the elevated

[1] For the Lives of Saints, see D. G. Scragg, "The Corpus of Anonymous Lives and Their Manuscript Context," in *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints' Lives and their Contexts*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, SUNY Series in Medieval Studies (Albany, NY, 1996), pp. 209–30. On this issue see also Esther Lemmerz's contribution to this volume.

[2] Note that by "CCCC 162" throughout this paper I refer to entry 38 in Ker, *Catalogue*, 51 ff., since one quire of what has come down to us as part of CCCC 162 originally belonged to CCCC 178 and was removed (probably) by Archbishop Parker in the sixteenth century. CCCC 162 is closely related textually to Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 340 and CCCC 198, yet excludes the Lives of Saints pieces which are included in those collections. For a full examination of CCCC 162 and its relations with other manuscripts, see D. G. Scragg, "Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162," in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and Their Heritage*, ed. Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine M. Treharne (Ashgate, 1998), pp. 71–83.

language and imagery of poetry. But such questions lie outside the scope of this essay. The seemingly more straightforward question of what constitutes an anonymous prose homily is the one which I propose to address here, and consequently how we arrive at a total corpus of them.

It is generally accepted in Old English studies that we divide homilies (and we should remember that there are more homilies surviving from the period than any other genre except charters, and more scribes involved in copying them) into those by Ælfric and those by Wulfstan,[3] with the rest being described as "anonymous," in other words of unknown authorship. This is the pattern adopted by Angus Cameron in his list of Old English texts compiled for the *Dictionary of Old English*.[4] Cameron divided texts into a number of categories, A for poetry, B for prose, etc, with prose texts further divided into 1 for Ælfric, 2 for Wulfstan, 3 for Anonymous Homilies. The last group was further subdivided into *Temporale*, *Sanctorale*, and items for unspecified occasions, with those under *Temporale* listed according to the day for which the item is set. The problem with this last category, however, is that not all copyists conformed to it, some scribes assigning a piece to one particular day, others to a different day, still others to no occasion at all. If we take a simple example, there are many surviving copies, partial or complete, of the item which we call Vercelli X, Blickling IX, or Napier's "Wulfstan" homily XLIX, and which Cameron numbers

[3] For a working list of the works of Ælfric on which all subsequent studies depend, see P. A. M. Clemoes, "The Chronology of Ælfric's Works," in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. Peter Clemoes (London, 1959), pp. 212–47. For Wulfstan, see Dorothy Bethurum, ed., *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford, 1957).

[4] Angus Cameron, "A List of Old English Texts," in *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*, ed. Roberta Frank and Angus Cameron (Toronto, 1973), pp. 25–306.

B3.2.40.[5] Under this number, Cameron lists six manuscript items, only three of them being complete, that in the Vercelli Book, and two copies of Napier XLIX, the one in CCCC 302 and the one in CCCC 421.[6] Two further copies of the item have been partially lost because of damage to the manuscripts concerned,[7] while another, in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343, is listed by Cameron as "partial" because it has been adapted by the addition of parts of another item. Still other copies or partial copies exist, although not listed under this heading by Cameron perhaps because they have been abbreviated,[8] while passages from the piece have been inserted into other items.[9] Cameron assigns B3.2.40 to Tuesday in Rogationtide because of supporting evidence from two of the surviving copies: in the Blickling manuscript it is rubricated *to þam oþerum gangdæge* (fol. 63v), although the heading has later been erased, while in CCCC 302 it is marked *Feria .III. in letania maiore* (fol. 221r). However, the rest of the surviving copies are not marked by their scribes for any particular day. In CCCC 421 the piece is rubricated *larspel* (p. 170, homily, sermon) and in the Vercelli Book there is no heading at all, although its copy does have a brief unique introductory paragraph which might explain its change to a homily for an unspecified occasion.[10] There may therefore be

[5] See *VH*, pp. 96–213. For the Blickling versions, see *BH*, pp. 105–7, and that in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 85/86, fol. 2r. See Napier, pp. 250–65. On the Vercelli X group see also Robert K. Upchurch's contribution to this volume.

[6] Full details can be found in *VH*, pp. 191–95.

[7] This is the case with the Blickling manuscript and with Junius 85/86. See *VH*, p. 196.

[8] An item in London, BL, Cotton Faustina A. xi and an additional item in CCCC 302.

[9] Napier XXX in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113, fols. 73r–80v, and the items which draw on it. See *VH*, Appendix.

[10] In Bodley 343 the Napier XLIX material is not at the beginning of the piece and this may explain its being set for a different day.

some justification for Cameron marking the piece for a particular day on the basis of two surviving copies, but the problem of ordering items in this way is plainly apparent.

It is well known, of course, that preachers even today constantly revise the material they offer to their flock on a year by year basis. Cameron's B3.2.40 is a perfect example of the practice in pre- and post-Conquest England in that surviving copies vary so widely.[11] Wulfstan revised his Bethurum homily XX at least three times,[12] while Ælfric continually reworked his homilies throughout his lifetime.[13] The point at issue is how do we count an author's revised texts, as new homilies or simply as old ones revamped? And in a culture necessarily dependent on antecedents—true of the culture as a whole but particularly true of ecclesiastical literature where the danger of heresy is a continuing problem—this may not be a simple question to answer. By Cameron's count, we have around 120 items by Ælfric, around 24 by Wulfstan, with the rest being considered anonymous. But counting "the rest" is no easy task since Cameron's list is far from exhaustive as it stands, as this essay will attempt to show.

Determining what may be regarded as a "new" homily is certainly easier to decide with regard to authored homilies than anonymous ones, since with the latter there is no assurance with revisions that the same man rewrote his own work, and in many cases we can

[11] See the variants in *VH*, pp. 158–84.

[12] See Bethurum, *Homilies of Wulfstan*, pp. 255–75.

[13] The many rewritings of the First Series are very fully explored in Peter Clemoes's introduction to *CH* I. It may be worth noting in passing that in an article that incorporated a review of this edition, the text of which is based on the earliest surviving copy (London, BL, Royal 7. C. xii), I criticized Clemoes's decision as out of step with modern editorial practice, which is to use an author's last known revision, see Donald Scragg, "Editing Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*," *Anglia* 121 (2003), 610–18, esp. 615–16.

prove that he did not.[14] Even with items such as Vercelli X / Blickling IX / Napier's "Wulfstan" homily XLIX which Cameron lists as a single composition, considerable textual variation between copies suggests that we should regard them not as one homily but as several. As I noted above, Cameron lists six copies of B3.2.40. The Vercelli Book copy, as has already been stated, has a unique opening paragraph, in Bodley 343 the Napier XLIX material follows a passage which is taken from another item,[15] and there are numerous verbal differences between the copies of the text printed and collated by Napier from CCCC 421 and CCCC 302.[16] To take another example from the homilies which Napier prints in his collection of items attributed to Wulfstan, Cameron lists five copies of Napier XL as B3.4.32: items in CCCC 201, CCCC 419, London, BL, Cotton Cleopatra B. xiii, London, Lambeth Palace Library 489, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 114. Lambeth 489 has only a few lines of this long homily, as Ker makes clear,[17] and so it cannot be seen as a straightforward copy of it. As for the other four, Napier XL is itself an adaptation of the first section of Vercelli II expanded in the style of Wulfstan, as I demonstrate in my edition of the Vercelli homilies,[18] but the four copies of it which Napier prints and collates are not themselves versions of the same item. For although CCCC 419 is close to Vercelli II textually in those parts which overlap, the ending is entirely different, while Cleopatra B. xiii and Hatton 114 have a different opening from the other two, and Hatton 114 has a different ending. In short,

[14] Manuscript evidence alone is insufficient to group any anonymous pieces together as from the same pen, hence to talk of the "Vercelli Homilies" or the "Blickling Homilies" as if they were composed by author V or author B is in no way supported by stylistic or any other evidence.

[15] See Ivine VII, pp. 107–202. On this homily see also Thijs Porck's contribution to this volume.

[16] See Napier, pp. 250–65, who prints his text from CCCC 421 with full variants from CCCC 302 (his D).

[17] Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 344.

[18] See *VH*, p. 48 ff.

Cameron's list cannot be taken as a satisfactory point for establishing the corpus of anonymous homilies in Old English.

In an article published a few years after Cameron's list appeared, I produced a list of my own,[19] taking manuscripts as my starting point rather than the homilies themselves, and thus attempting to see items in their manuscript context. The list was designed to isolate the corpus of homilies in existence prior to the work of Ælfric, and was related to my then on-going edition of the Vercelli homilies. But although the title suggested that the items with which the article was concerned were "before Ælfric," with the exception of the Vercelli Book itself, the manuscripts in which they survived were all in fact post-Ælfric. Ælfric sent his first two series of homilies to Archbishop Sigeric around 990 A.D. The closest manuscripts to this date are the Blickling manuscript which palaeographic evidence suggests was written some time during the following decade or perhaps slightly later, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 340/342 which is roughly contemporary with Blickling itself.[20] But although it was copied some time after Ælfric began to publish, Blickling has no Ælfric items at all, and presumably drew on a body of writings which was without access to Ælfrician material (i.e. a library outside Wessex), and a reference to the year 971 A.D. in the text of Blickling XI suggests that some of its items, at least, were contemporary with the copying of the Vercelli collection a generation before Ælfric published his work by sending a copy or

[19] "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric," *ASE* 8 (1979), 223–77, repr. with an Appendix in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, Basic Readings on Anglo-Saxon England 5 (New York and London, 2000), pp. 73–150.

[20] Ker, *Catalogue*, dates the Blickling manuscript "s. x/xi" (p. 451) and Bodley 340/342 "s. xi in.–xi med." (p. 361). For a detailed bibliography of the evidence for dating both, see the relevant introductions to the manuscripts by Jonathan Wilcox in *Homilies by Ælfric and Other Homilies*, ASMMF 17, Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies (Tempe, AZ, 2008).

copies to Archbishop Sigeric.[21] Bodley 340/342 by contrast has a number of anonymous items amongst its predominantly Ælfric collection, and this offers an interesting glimpse of a centre which had access to Ælfrician material but which retained an earlier body of homiletic writings. Beyond Vercelli, Blickling, and Bodley 340/342, all manuscripts containing anonymous homilies are now dated palaeographically to the eleventh century or later. However, the date of the manuscript in which an item is recorded does not necessarily equate with date of its composition, and many of the homilies recorded exclusively in the eleventh century or beyond may have been in existence before Ælfric, as the collection in Bodley 340/342 suggests. This argument formed the basis of my 1979 essay. But because that essay was basically concerned to show the extent of pre-Ælfrician homilies, it is as unsatisfactory as a starting-point for this project as Cameron's list. Happily, the ECHOE project is concerned with homilies up to the end of the twelfth century, happily because there is no doubt that homilies continued to be composed in the eleventh century and beyond by individuals other than Ælfric and Wulfstan, and the magnitude of the achievement of the two named homilists should not blind us to the contribution of their unnamed contemporaries and successors.

The most obvious examples of such compositions are those homilies up to the end of the twelfth century which we call composite, in other words those pieces which draw on two or more earlier items and fuse them, or parts of them, into a new whole. Two examples which include passages from Ælfric are given in Malcolm Godden's essay on composite homilies from Winchester.[22] These are not included in my 1979 list yet they surely belong in one designed for the ECHOE project because they obviously have no known author, and since they contain Ælfrician material cannot be described, in my terms, as "before Ælfric." There are many other items which contain excerpts from Ælfric material that have been altered by

[21] Blickling XI, p. 119, line 2.

[22] M. R. Godden, "Old English Composite Homilies from Winchester," *ASE* 4 (1975), 57–65.

the addition of matter that is certainly or possibly not by Ælfric himself—and therefore must be considered anonymous—such as John Pope's item XXIX in his edition of the Supplementary Homilies of Ælfric which he entitles "Macarius and the Magicians Saul and the Witch of Endor."[23] Among many composite pieces which include Wulfstan material is Napier homily XXX, which incorporates extracts from four Vercelli homilies, together with one passage of undoubted Wulfstan authorship, derived from his *Institutes of Polity*, and many further passages of what is probably no more than Wulfstan pastiche.[24] Finally, there are many examples of composite homilies which consist solely of passages drawn from homilies of unknown authorship.[25] A good example is Assmann XIV, found in Cotton Faustina A. ix and CCCC 302, all of which is taken from known anonymous pieces, apart from a short section which was possibly drawn from a lost version of Vercelli XV.[26] Another interesting example is the fragmentary item published by Ray Page,[27] which consists of a single vertical strip of parchment from the middle of a leaf where text can still be read on either side of the strip, each segment of text being part of an anonymous item which survives elsewhere. Again, when complete, this must have been a composite homily.[28] So we have composite homilies which draw on Ælfric, those which draw on Wulfstan, and those which use anonymous material alone. All these must be included under the heading of "anonymous homilies."

---

[23] For details of the composition of this item, see Pope, pp. 786–89.

[24] For details, see D. G. Scragg, "Napier's 'Wulfstan' Homily XXX: Its Sources, Its Relationship to the Vercelli Book and its Style," *ASE* 6 (1977), 197–211. For an edition, see the appendix to *VH*, pp. 395–403.

[25] For examples, see my "Corpus of Vernacular Homilies."

[26] See my "Corpus of Vernacular Homilies," 245–6. On this connection see also Charles D. Wright's essay in this volume.

[27] R. I. Page, "An Old English Fragment from Westminister Abbey," *ASE* 25 (1996), 201–7.

[28] On its relations with extant composite pieces, see Page, op. cit.

My essay on homilies "before Ælfric" cited above was an attempt to establish the range of homiletic material available before Ælfric's series of homilies designed to be preached on Sundays and feast-days throughout the year were published and became popular. The anonymous items are found in manuscripts from the Vercelli Book (dated palaeographically to the 970s) to Bodley 343 of the later twelfth century—a period covering around two hundred years. And the manuscripts are, by and large, the products of the larger centres in the South and West of England, from Canterbury and Winchester, and in the eleventh century also from Worcester and Exeter. But another partial homily underlying Latin material in a ninth-century Northumbrian manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 63, has been recently discovered.[29] A homiletic item which was available for copying north of the Humber and in the ninth century is potentially an important find in that it extends the area in which homilies were composed and copied to the whole of England. Because of the chance survival of the Digby 63 fragment, we can now move the history of the vernacular homily back by another century. In fact, there have long been a number of critics who ascribed certain items to the ninth century although they now survive only in later copies. Joan Turville-Petre, for example, claimed that Vercelli III was of ninth-century origin,[30] and the same claim has been made for a number of saints' lives too.[31] Since the advent of the Digby 63 evidence, we can now be certain that some homilies (and potentially saints' lives) in English existed somewhere at least in the ninth century. But although we have evidence of an increasing output of non-homiletic material in English in Southern England throughout the

[29] Donald Scragg, "A Ninth-Century Old English Homily from Northumbria," *ASE* 45 (2017), 39–48. See also Winfried Rudolf, "The Earliest Surviving Homily in English," *N&Q* n.s. 66 (2019), 24–26.

[30] Joan Turville-Petre, "Translations of a Lost Penitential Homily," *Traditio* 19 (1963), 51–78.

[31] Rudolf Vleeskruyer, in an edition of the Life of Saint Chad which is based on a unique copy in a twelfth-century manuscript (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116), created an elaborate thesis claiming that the text was originally written in the ninth century (see his *The Life of St Chad* [Amsterdam, 1953]).

tenth century, no copy of a vernacular homily or evidence of one has survived from the first three-quarters of it, and this is surely a very significant fact. It would appear that the real outpourings of vernacular homilies began with the Benedictine Reform in the 960s, and that although it is clear from the chance survival of Digby 63 that the vernacular homiletic tradition began long before that, it may have comprised relatively little material.

This is not the place to discuss the possible early development of the vernacular homily in that this essay is solely concerned with the corpus which survives. Nor is it appropriate to consider here the audience to which early homiletic material was directed.[32] It is worth looking at the sources from which Old English homilies derive, however, since that directly affects my argument here. Much research has been undertaken in recent years on the Latin sources of Old English homilies,[33] a great deal of it encouraged by major source projects, both by the now sadly discontinued work on the electronic *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*, and by the ongoing publication, both hard-copy and electronic, of work on the *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture* project (recently renamed as *Sources of Old English and Anglo-Latin Literary Culture*). Such source studies provide important background information which, in turn, illuminates the editing of the homilies themselves. This work is an obvious corollary of a corpus of edited homilies, each illuminating the other but each nevertheless independent. We have enough surviving early homilies to show that these were often directly based on Latin antecedents—in other words were close translations of their Latin sources[34]—but the inherited material might be supplemented by vernacular sources (i.e. by the adaptation

[32] The interested reader might begin with Milton McC. Gatch, "The Unknowable Audience of the Blickling Homilies," *ASE* 18 (1989), 99–115, and with the introduction to Bazire-Cross.

[33] On sources, see other pieces in the present volume.

[34] Another way in which sermons were composed and preached is indicated by a recently discovered item which has brief Latin quotations with English translations; see Mechthild Gretsch, "The Taunton Fragment: A New Text from Anglo-Saxon England," *ASE* 33 (2004), 145–93.

of existing homilies in ways that I have already discussed), and in other ways which I will develop further below. Composite homilies were not new in the eleventh century. In the Vercelli Book, dated palaeographically to the 970s, homily XXI is composite because it draws, amongst other texts, on Vercelli II, and no doubt there was an earlier tradition of composite homilies if, as we now know, the vernacular homiletic tradition can be traced back into the ninth century. Certainly, as the surviving evidence shows, the number and variety of composite homilies grew during the eleventh century and beyond. In sum, as I observed at the end of the introduction to my *Conspectus of Scribal Hands*:[35]

> as the eleventh century progressed, rather than English homiletic material being dependent on Latin sources, homilists drew on earlier English items. It is customary to refer to these homilies as composite, but the term, in fact, obscures their true nature. Their authors are using English sources in the way that earlier writers used Latin, but whereas Latin had to be translated, English sermons were now used as source books verbatim. The fundamental principle of usage remains the same, but English had now become a language of authority, and texts written in it were seen as authoritative works.[36]

This, i.e. the simple absorption of material from one item to another, is something that will be increasingly apparent as the ECHOE corpus develops, and the fact that it is at the forefront of the minds of the designers of ECHOE is made clear by the acronym chosen for the project.

---

[35] Donald Scragg, *A Conspectus of Scribal Hands Writing English, 960–1100* (Cambridge, 2012), p. xiii.

[36] For further examination of the development and use of the vernacular during the late Old English period, see Mechthild Gretsch, "Winchester Vocabulary and Standard Old English: The Vernacular in Late Anglo-Saxon England," T. Northcote Toller Memorial Lecture 2000, *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 83 (2001), 41–87.

If preachers like the authors of Vercelli XXI, Napier XXX, and other composite pieces can be said to have composed "new" homilies, even though their material is "old," how far can we develop that idea? Does a piece which survives in one form and can be shown to have been modified in a manuscript copy, perhaps for use by another preacher on a different occasion or in different circumstances, count as two homilies rather than one? There are very large questions involved here, such as what constitutes authorship in a period which equates adaptation as a mode of creation. I do not intend to propose an answer to this particular question in this paper, but it is certainly a matter which needs to be addressed before any decision is taken on what to include in a list of anonymous items. And other means of creating "new" homilies also need to be considered, e.g., the adaptation of existing pieces by changing or adding a small amount of new material.

A number of examples illustrate the last problem. First, some Ælfric items since the use of Ælfrician material can be identified most readily. Among the Lives of Saints collection in BL, Cotton Julius E. vii, the items of which are largely but not wholly by Ælfric, there are numerous alterations by a variety of hands. Art. 16 in Ker's *Catalogue*, for example, which is set for the Wednesday before Lent, ends in Ælfric's words with "Sy him a wuldor" (Let there be glory to him for ever)[37] which is then followed by an intervention by a later scribe who adds a further sentence, "ðe leofað 7 rixað on ecnysse ece drihten" (who lives and rules in eternity, eternal Lord) and then an interlinear phrase "ðonne nu todæg beoð" (than are now today) either at the same time or at a later date. Should we regard this homily with its additions as a new anonymous piece, i.e. an adaptation of an Ælfric homily? In this case, the answer is probably "no," since this is basically an Ælfrician piece, although if it were preached with the marginal additions, it could possibly be seen as an anonymous work. Similarly, at the end of a sequence of homilies for general occasions at the beginning of the

[37] Translations, unless otherwise indicated, are my own.

manuscript, CCCC 162 has one Ælfrician item with a marginal addition by a different scribe near its close. The addition was noted by Ker[38] and recorded in a footnote to his edition by Godden.[39] By printing it in a footnote and in italics, Godden indicated that the addition is not, in his view, by Ælfric, and therefore, of necessity, by an unknown hand. The ECHOE database will clearly highlight such marginal additions to anonymous items, although they may not actually define them as constituting independent texts, or even, as in the instances cited here, include them at all if what are basically Ælfrician items are excluded. But they are nonetheless anonymous homiletic pieces in that the Ælfric material, or part of it, has been rethought. There are a great many more similar minor adaptations in the material that has come down to us, including some adaptations of anonymous works. But before I turn to the anonymous corpus proper, I should like to draw attention to one last Ælfrician piece. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115, article 28 (which is also found as Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121, art. 34) is what I would argue to be a Worcester adaptation of Ælfric since both Hatton 115 and Junius 121 are Worcester manuscripts. It consists of Ælfric's preface to his First Series of homilies adapted to form a homily, with sections at the beginning and the end omitted, and a doxology added at the close. The resulting piece is clearly a new homily, but not one designed by Ælfric himself. Whether it is "by" Ælfric or by an anonymous writer the designers of ECHOE will have to decide, but obviously I would advocate the latter. I suspect that Jonathan Wilcox, the authority on Ælfric's prefaces, might agree, since Hatton 115 is not

[38] Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 52, art. 8.

[39] *CH* II, XII, p. 126: "Eac þa læwedan and ungelæredan hlystan lare and lifes wege. and huru him to langsum ne ðince on godes huse to gehlystenne drihtnes þenunge. seo us forðtihteð to þam ecean life" (Also the lay people and the unlettered should hear the divine teaching and the true way of life, and certainly it should not seem too tedious to listen to the service of the Lord in God's house which leads us towards the eternal life).

cited in his list of manuscripts containing the prefaces.[40] In my view this item should be included in a list of anonymous homilies and thus added to the homiletic corpus of them, even though there is virtually nothing in it which was not written by Ælfric, although for a different purpose.[41]

The point at issue here is how major does an adaptation have to be before a piece is no longer classed as a copy of an original homily (or non-homiletic work), or, to put it more positively, how much adaptation is needed to create a new piece? CCCC 162, a manuscript which mainly consists of Ælfric pieces, but which has some anonymous items, including a few that are in the Vercelli collection, offers some useful examples here. Ker's item 32 in that manuscript (a homily for Easter Sunday) is widely accepted as an anonymous piece although it has passages from Ælfric's Easter sermon from the Second Series incorporated in it. In that way, it is similar to Napier homily XXX with its Wulfstan section, which is regarded as a composite homily. But there are other items in CCCC 162 which are more difficult to define. Ker's article 14, which is Ælfric's piece for Ash Wednesday in the Lives of Saints series, begins in CCCC 162 with a short introduction which is not by Ælfric, in fact in phraseology it sounds like Wulfstan, with tags like *understande se ðe wille* (let him understand it who will). The following is the introduction in its entirety before the piece moves into Ælfric material:

[40] Jonathan Wilcox, ed., *Ælfric's Prefaces*, Durham Medieval Texts 9 (Durham 1994).

[41] The reverse may be true in a few cases, where items have been wrongly classified as homilies. It has recently been argued that an item in Junius 121 which has traditionally been regarded as an anonymous homily (Cameron lists it under "Homilies for unspecified occasions" and gives it the number B.3.5.10) might not be a homily at all but a penitential tract: see Helen Foxhall Forbes, "Affective Piety and the Practice of Penance in Late Eleventh-Century Worcester: The Address to the Penitent in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121," *ASE* 44 (2016), 309–45.

> We willað eow areccan gyt ane lytle tihtinge embe ure gemænan sawle þearfe. 7 **eow is micel þearf þæt ge hyt mid micele gymene understandon** þæt we eow secgan willað. We hyt nagon to forsuwigenne þæt we folce heora þearfe ne secgan, **understande se ðe wille**. Þis spel þe ic eow secgan wille. gebyrað nu on wodnesdæg on þyssere wucan. ac we hyt wyllað nu eow asecgan. for ðan þingon þe her beoð nu todæg manna ma þonne on wodnesdæg beon; Nu secg ic eow þæt æghwilcum men gebyrað **mid rihte** ... (Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. 52–53, my highlights)

> "We intend to relate to you yet a brief instruction for the general benefit of the soul and it **is very important that you follow with great care** what we intend to tell you. We will not conceal what we tell for the profit of the people, **let him understand it who will**. This homily which I will tell you on Wednesday of this week though we wish to tell it now because here now today there are more people than will be on Wednesday; Now I tell you that it is fitting for each person **truly** …

The more obvious Wulfstan phrases are printed in bold type here. It is clearly impossible that Ælfric would have written this introduction, given what we know of him as an author, so we cannot situate the item in the Ælfrician canon. Similarly, I doubt if Wulfstan would have written it either, because although he undoubtedly used Ælfrician material elsewhere, he recreated it in his own style. This particular version of Ælfric's Ash Wednesday homily, with its introductory section, becomes part of the anonymous corpus, although heavily indebted to its Ælfric forebear. But then many anonymous pieces such as Napier homily XXX are indebted to known English antecedents. For example, there is an addition in the margin of CCCC 162 by a hand which is not that of the main scribe but one which occurs more than once in the manuscript as a whole. It reads "swa swa us dæghwamlice on ufan sitt ægðer ge on heregangum ge on oðrum mislicum unbelimpum" (as daily oppress us both with invasion

and with various kinds of misfortune). Here the subject matter suggests that the additional note refers to contemporary events, in that the manuscript was written at the very beginning of the eleventh century, when Viking attacks against King Æthelred's England were at their worst, and it has been suggested that the "heregangum" referred to are Viking armies on English soil. The argument is put forward in an article by Kathryn Powell[42] but is somewhat undermined by problems of date—the manuscript is palaeographically assigned to early in the eleventh century but Ker dates the marginal addition to the middle of the first half of the century and that would be during the reign of Cnut when Viking attacks had ceased. Powell's argument cannot be entirely dismissed, however, in that annotations are notoriously difficult to date. But the central question concerns the location of this piece in the canon. Should we consider it, with the addition of this marginal note, to be an independent homily, one made relevant to current events by a preacher concerned for the safety of his flock?

CCCC 162 has a number of marginal additions which create "new" homilies out of old ones, especially from copies of homilies by Ælfric. I have already considered Ker's art. 14. Ker also lists an alternative opening to another Ælfric item (his art.12),[43] and there are alternative readings in the margins of the texts of art. 16 and 25. Ker also notes marginal additions in the text of the anonymous arts. 28 and 36.[44] A particularly notable example of such alterations is that to Ker's art. 28, one of two successive Palm Sunday homilies. It is noteworthy that two successive Palm Sunday items are also found at a comparable point in Bodley 340 and CCCC 198, two manuscripts which are in many ways related to CCCC 162,

[42] Kathryn Powell, "Viking Invasions and Marginal Annotations in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162," *ASE* 37 (2008), 151–71.

[43] Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 52. Note that Godden, in *CH* II, XIX, p. 180, puts the marginal note into italics in his collation notes indicating that he does not consider the words to be by Ælfric.

[44] Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 54.

but in both cases an item from Ælfric's First Series occurs first, rather than one from the Second Series as in CCCC 162. For the second of the two Palm Sunday pieces all three manuscripts have the same anonymous item, but the copy in CCCC 162 includes some forty alterations, mainly interlinear additions by a scribe writing half a century later than the main scribe, and there are also many erasures of words and phrases.[45] Effectively, this creates a new homily from that recorded in Bodley 340 and CCCC 198. A further example of alteration to an item from CCCC 162 is discussed below.[46]

A rather different example of the way in which items grew in the course of transmission is offered by Ælfric in *CH* I, XXI (a homily for Ascension Day), in the copy in Hatton 113/114 (which are two parts of a single writing exercise) when compared with the related CCCC 178. In the latter, marginal additions have been added by a hand slightly later than that of the main hand: "þe man nu on þunres dæi rædde" (which now is read on Thursday; *CH* I, XXI, line 2), and "on þunres dæi þe nu wæs on þissere wucan" (on the Thursday of this week, *CH* I, XXI, line 85). The same scribe adds the words "kinigum" (kings) after "ricum" (kingdoms) and "kaserum" (emperors) after "reþum" (strong) interlinear in the phrase "ricum 7 reþum" (the powerful and strong, *CH* I, XXI, line 54). All of these

[45] A recent article on this Palm Sunday item in Bodley 340 and Corpus 198 fails to mention that a third copy exists in Corpus 162, see R. D. Fulk, "The Refashioning of Christ's Passion in an Anonymous Old English Homily for Palm Sunday (HomS 18)," *JEGP* 116 (2017), 415–37.

[46] Alternative beginnings and endings to Ælfric homilies are also to be found in the margins and between the lines of other manuscripts, e.g. Bodley 340/342 and Hatton 113/114. For marginal annotations to the former pair of manuscripts, see the appropriate introduction in Wilcox, *Homilies of Ælfric* (see above n. 20), p. 53 ff.; for the latter pair, see Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 41, pp. 394–95. Amongst "new" anonymous homilies in Bodley 340, the most obvious is the Good Friday piece (also found in CCCC 162, CCCC 198 and CCCC 303) which parallels in part Vercelli homily I but is far longer than the latter (see *VH*, pp. 1–47). Cameron groups all of these together as B.3.2.24, but clearly they constitute two distinct items, and I print them *en face*.

marginal and interlinear entries in CCCC 178 are included in the text of the copy in Hatton 114 (art. 57), in other words all had been incorporated into the homily. CCCC 178 and Hatton 113/114 were both written in Worcester and there can be little doubt that the late additions in CCCC 178 have been incorporated into the text in Hatton 113/114 either directly or indirectly.[47] These changes were not made by Ælfric, and thus must be accounted anonymous. All of these additions, marginal and otherwise, to Ælfrician texts—and I have listed only a few of the many that exist—must in some sense be counted part of the anonymous homiletic corpus. Should they not therefore form part of the ECHOE project, perhaps as an adjunct? The great virtue of an electronic database is that it can allow many different adaptations and permutations, and even a list of anonymous writers' alterations to authored homilies such as those by Ælfric might in itself be a useful tool. And a collection of the changes themselves would be even more useful than a list.

Some adaptations can consist of no more than occasional changes of individual words or phrases. A good example of the former may be found near the beginning of Napier XLIX where the text in the Blickling manuscript / CCCC 421 / CCCC 302 refers to Christ as *se goldbloma*, translated by Morris in his edition as "the golden blossom" but corrected in Bosworth-Toller to "a golden mass," while Vercelli has the more mundane and familiar *se ælmihtega dryhten* (the almighty Lord).[48] It is impossible to know for certain which version came first, but it seems probable that the unique form *goldbloma*, reminiscent in its linguistic

[47] See Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. 63 and 396; and *CH* I, XXI, collation notes to lines 2 and 85. For another marginal addition to CCCC 178 which is not in Hatton 114, see Clemoes's collation to line 36. The additions in *CH* I, XXI, lines 2, 36 and 85 relate to Ascension Day for which the piece is set, and are therefore not significant, but the words added in both manuscripts in line 54 are substantive changes aimed at clarifying the text. It is interesting that CCCC 178 has marginal and interlinear additions throughout the manuscript, but the four in the Ascension Day homily are by a scribe whose hand does not appear elsewhere in the manuscript.

[48] See *VH*, p. 197, note to text lines 20–21.

compression of poetic compounds, derives from the original, and was simplified for a less sophisticated audience in the Vercelli version, even though the Vercelli Book copy is palaeographically at least twenty years earlier than Blickling. Another simple example involving both updating of language and change of vocabulary occurs in Assmann XIV, the opening section of which is dependent upon Blickling VIII, and where we find Assmann XIV: "he a rode ahangen wæs" (he was hanged on the cross) as against Blickling VIII: "he on rodegalgan astag" (he ascended onto the rood-gallows).[49] Such alterations are ubiquitous in the creation of new homilies from old.

My final example again involves CCCC 162. It concerns a homily that we can see being adapted in a way similar to others in that manuscript that I have already considered in some detail above, but it is even more significant in that we can see an alteration in one manuscript being carried over into another copy of the piece. In this case, however, the whole example concerns an anonymous homily rather than material from an Ælfric piece in CCCC 178 and Hatton 113/114. As I have shown above, CCCC 162 is heavily marked by a series of preachers adapting existing homilies to their own use, both items by Ælfric and, in this case, a piece which the manuscript tradition shows existed long before Ælfric wrote. The item involved is the first of three related homilies in the Vercelli Book, Vercelli XIX–XXI. Vercelli XIX is listed by Cameron (Cameron B3.2.34) as surviving in four manuscripts. Obviously the Vercelli copy is the earliest, followed, in date order, by the CCCC 162 copy of very early in the eleventh century, one in Cleopatra B. xiii written in Exeter late in the eleventh century, and finally one in CCCC 303 written in the early twelfth century. The Exeter copy incorporates a series of extracts from Ælfric's First Series homily for the Monday in Rogationtide (a piece which incidentally uses the same sources as the anonymous homilist), and thus may be classified, strictly speaking, as a straightforward composite homily, rather

[49] Assmann XIV, p. 164, line 9; Blickling VIII, p. 97, line 3.

than a copy of Vercelli XIX.[50] It is best regarded therefore as one of many anonymous pieces which might be called "Leofric homilies," items which were adapted at Exeter or, at least, are known only from Exeter manuscripts.[51] The other three copies of Vercelli XIX are closely linked, despite a wide disparity between the date of their copying (150 years from the Vercelli Book to CCCC 303). Most pertinently, they all appear to have been written in the Southeast. CCCC 162 was at Rochester during the eleventh century but by its script and decoration was probably created at Canterbury.[52] It seems likely that CCCC 303 was copied either from an ancestor of CCCC 162 at Rochester or from a closely related copy of it, part of the evidence for that being offered below. Finally, I argued long ago that the Vercelli scribe drew on southeastern sources for his book and, although disputed by Celia Sisam in her EEMF volume,[53] it has subsequently been generally agreed.[54]

Vercelli XIX begins with an account of the fall of the angels.[55] The part of that account that is of interest here involves an alteration in the copy in CCCC 162 which is not by the main hand and which occurs in the middle of a page. The alteration has not been easy to see in the electronic reproduction in Parker Library on the Web because of the show-through of the ornamental initial **M** from the beginning of the piece on the previous page, but with the

---

[50] The additions can be found in *VH*, pp. 320–25, at the foot of the relevant pages.

[51] For other "Leofric" adaptations, see Elaine Treharne, "The Bishop's Book: Leofric's Homiliary and Eleventh-Century Exeter," in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, ed. Stephen Baxter, et al. (Farnham, Surrey, 2008), pp. 521–37.

[52] See Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 56.

[53] Celia Sisam, ed., *The Vercelli Book*, EEMF 19 (Copenhagen, 1976).

[54] Cf. Peter J. Lucas, "The Vercelli Book Revisited," in *The Genesis of Books: Studies in the Scribal Culture of Medieval England in Honour of A. N. Doane*, ed. Matthew T. Hussey and John D Niles, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 9 (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 161–74.

[55] The copies in CCCC 162 and CCCC 303 can be seen in electronic form in the Parker Library on the Web database. The text and variants are all in *VH*, p. 315 ff.

remarkable clarity which can now be achieved by manipulating that electronic corpus, it is possible to make the new reading out sufficiently well. At the conclusion of the account of the rebellion of Lucifer, the homilist says of the latter's abode in the northern part of heaven "he of þam ricene afeoll" (from which he quickly fell). Although this clause is present in the account as copied by the CCCC 162 main hand, however, it is underlined for erasure, and above it and continued in the margin an annotator has added "him se ræd ne geðeag ac werð swyðe biterlice forgolden him sylfan" (that plan [i.e. the rebellion against God] did not work for him but he himself was very painfully rewarded for it). The fall, although a popular motif amongst the Anglo-Saxons, is, of course, not mentioned in the Bible, and this may have been the cause of the annotator's concern with the Vercelli formulation. In CCCC 303 there is no mention whatever of the fall itself but only the words with which the annotator of CCCC 162 replaced the original (i.e. that in Vercelli) clause.[56] It is this point that forms part of the argument for CCCC 303 being copied directly or indirectly from CCCC 162, as the added words in CCCC 162 were most probably contributed by one of the annotators of that manuscript.[57]

This point can be taken a step further in that we can locate the source of the CCCC 162 addition: the first half comes from a passage in Vercelli XXI and the second anticipates words from a later point in the homilist's discussion in Vercelli XIX: compare Vercelli XXI, line 145 "him se ræd ne geþah" with the CCCC 162 annotation "him se ræd ne geðeag," and compare Vercelli XIX, lines 43–44 "hit him wearð biterlice forgolden" with CCCC 162 "ac werð swyðe biterlice forgolden." In short, there is nothing "new" in the intervention by the CCCC 162 annotator, in the sense of no new thought, but he seems to be uncomfortable with

[56] Cf. CCCC 162 annotation: "him se ræd ne geðeag ac werð swyðe biterlice forgolden him sylfan" with CCCC 303: "him se ræd ne geþah ac wearð swiðe biterlice forgoldan him sylfan."

[57] It is, of course, possible that the words were found in a different manuscript and copied into CCCC 162 by an annotator, and thence found their way by another route into CCCC 303—but here we enter the realms of fantasy.

the reference to the fall which may have been felt to be suspect. What makes this alteration particularly fascinating textually is that only one copy of Vercelli XXI survives and that is the one in the Vercelli Book. The annotator of CCCC 162 must therefore have taken the words either from the Vercelli Book itself (which is unlikely given that, by the time the annotation was made in CCCC 162, the Vercelli Book had probably reached Northern Italy where it remains to the present day), or there was at least one other copy of Vercelli XXI in existence in the early eleventh century. I have argued elsewhere that Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI, plus the Ascension Day homily which now survives in CCCC 162, were all composed by one person,[58] and it is just conceivable that that same person lived long enough to make changes in the margin of CCCC 162. In other words what we have here are authorial changes like those made by Ælfric in London, BL, Royal 7. C. xii. It seems far more likely however that there were copies of these pieces together in other manuscripts in a scriptorium in the Southeast, probably Christ Church, Canterbury, and that the annotator drew his quotation from what we now call Vercelli XXI from one of them.

What conclusion can we draw from this? It seems to me that one of the most important ways in which ECHOE will serve the academic community is by publishing the complete list of anonymous items which it promises in its proposed new nomenclature of homilies. But in order to be complete, that list should include homilies which have been adapted by revisers to make what have been described here as new compositions. If Napier homily XXX can be an independent homily, as Cameron and others indicate, then so should the expanded Exeter copy of Vercelli XIX in Cleopatra B. xiii which Cameron classifies with other versions of Vercelli XIX in B3.2.34. In short, I would argue that the need for a published list to replace

[58] D. G. Scragg, "An Old English Homilist of Archbishop Dunstan's Day," in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies presented to Helmut Gneuss on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Korhammer (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 181–92.

Cameron's is the first imperative for the ECHOE project, a list which will make ECHOE an enduring resource long before the electronic corpus itself is complete. Such a list could be an adaptation of Cameron's (e.g. the Exeter copy of Vercelli XIX might be B3.2.34a or B3.2.2.34.1), but it would probably be more useful to construct a new version cross-referenced to the *DOE* numbering system. I also believe that the ECHOE list should include the seemingly minor sorts of variation that I have outlined above.

The sequence that I have shown above regarding the development in Vercelli XIX, from the Vercelli Book itself, through CCCC 162, with its annotation, to the incorporation of that annotation in CCCC 303 (directly from CCCC 162 or from another manuscript into which this annotation was incorporated) is a most remarkable survival. There can be no doubt that by the time we get to CCCC 303 we have a different reading for this passage, one in which someone's concern in the early eleventh century about the reference to the non-biblical fall is implied. Together these survivals from the three southeastern copies of Vercelli XIX seem to me to be quite remarkable both for what they reveal about the move towards orthodoxy in a passage which the English homilist did not draw from his source,[59] and for what they show about the composition and the delivery of homilies in the eleventh century.

Does it mean that we should record it as a different homily? I believe that we should, for although CCCC 162 records both the original homily, represented by the Vercelli Book copy, as well as the later one through its alteration, in CCCC 303 we have a piece with a wholly different reading for this passage, the history of which we would have no record but for the survival of the annotation in CCCC 162. One of the many great virtues of ECHOE is its recording of all manuscript readings, which, however seemingly unimportant, might prove invaluable in revealing either ultimate relationships between manuscripts or more broadly the wider cultural concerns that underlie alterations. In other words, rather than banishing

[59] See *VH*, pp. 315–16.

relatively minor discrepancies to an apparatus, as has been the case with traditional hard-copy editions in the past, in all future editions, editors and their publishers (including the EETS) will serve the scholarly community best with the employment of parallel texts for all but the most minor of spelling variations. Indeed, even the inclusion of spelling variants in the apparatus could be beneficial in the production of a history of a grammar of late Old English.

Numerous other examples of seemingly minor alterations could be cited, but those discussed above are probably sufficient to illustrate the point. Even manuscripts which contain only (or mainly) anonymous pieces, such as the Blickling manuscript and Junius 85/86, have variants either in the manuscript itself[60] or between its version and that recorded elsewhere.[61] The one notable exception is the Vercelli Book which has no substantive intervention from a later scribe, possibly because the manuscript left England soon after it was written. I have in general avoided discussing twelfth-century material in this essay, even though this will be included in ECHOE, but detailed coverage of this period may be found in an important collection of essays published by Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne,[62] notably Mary Swan's "Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* in the Twelfth Century," Jonathan Wilcox's "Wulfstan and the Twelfth Century," and Susan Irvine's "The Compilation and Use of Manuscripts Containing Old English in the Twelfth Century" which lists anonymous pieces. Another important chapter in this collection is "Mnemonic Transmission of Old English Texts in the Post-Conquest Period" by Loredana Teresi which is highly significant in the light of all that has been said in this essay about the creation of "new" homilies from old.

---

[60] For details, cf. Jonathan Wilcox's introduction to the facsimile of the manuscript in his *Homilies by Ælfric and other Homilies* (see n. 20), pp. 129–30.

[61] See Ker, *Catalogue*, pp. 410–11.

[62] Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne, eds., *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, CSASE 30 (Cambridge, 2000).

It must be stressed at this point that the development of the ECHOE corpus, important as it is, should not of itself preclude the production of hard-copy editions, which supply information which the remit of the ECHOE project does not include, i.e. provide a complete textual apparatus, an introduction situating the material in its manuscript and cultural context, explanatory or other notes where necessary, and a glossary. Indeed, ECHOE will facilitate such editorial work. Hard-copy editions might be of individual homilies or of related groups, or they might be based on manuscripts, as some previous editions have been, editions such as the homilies of the Vercelli Book and of Bodley 343. A new edition of the Blickling homilies is an obvious desideratum.[63] Other possibilities include editions of the anonymous pieces in Bodley 340, those in CCCC 162, or those in Hatton 113 and 114 together with Junius 121, the last three of which are related in that they are the product of a single scribal enterprise. Such manuscript collections might then include anonymous additions or alterations to authored homilies. Alternatively, collections might be based around a particular season such as the Easter homilies from Palm Sunday to Easter Day, comparable with the Rogationtide homilies published by Joyce Bazire and J. E. Cross.[64] There are also other needful revisions of older published work, especially those published in the nineteenth century such as the anonymous pieces published by Assmann.

In conclusion I would like to turn to work which, although it may not involve editing as such, is closely related to it, and that is the production of an up-to-date bibliography of work on anonymous homilies. The remorseless advance of scholarship inevitably results in all editorial work becoming out of date with the passage of time. Hence, to take simple examples,

[63] The edition of the Blickling Homilies published by Richard J. Kelly in 2003 to replace Richard Morris's out-of-date edition is unfortunately far from satisfactory. Some of the drawbacks of Morris's edition are highlighted in Rudolph Willard's facsimile of the manuscript, *The Blickling Homilies*, EEMF 10 (Copenhagen, 1960).

[64] See Bazire-Cross (see also n. 32).

Irvine has replaced Belfour, Scragg has replaced Förster/Szarmach.[65] Cameron's list of texts which also contained editions and projected editions is now so thoroughly out of date as to be almost useless. The very short list of editions of anonymous homilies in North American doctoral dissertations included in Pulsiano's bibliography shows just how few were in existence in 1988.[66] The most recent full bibliography of anonymous homilies generally is that by Janet Bately,[67] which gives bibliographic information up to 1990 for each entry in Cameron's list of anonymous homilies, but after a quarter of a century this too now needs to be updated. The great advantage of an electronic bibliography is that constant updating is simple, and the ECHOE database can provide that for as long as it is serviced. Late in its life, ECHOE intends to supply charts of recurrent tropes and motifs in the homilies, but this can only be possible when the editorial work is complete. For the moment, we are dependent on more limited studies as Robert DiNapoli's index to themes in Ælfric, Wulfstan, and the Vercelli and Blickling homilies.[68]

The primary aim of this paper has been an attempt to assist in the development of the ECHOE corpus. Its main thrust has been to show that establishing the corpus of anonymous homilies in Old English is far from easy. For although the ECHOE project as at present

---

[65] See Irvine; Belfour; *VH*; Max Förster ed., *Die Vercelli-Homilien zum ersten Male herausgegeben*, vol. 1: *I–VIII Homilie*, BaP 12 (Hamburg, 1932, repr. Darmstadt, 1966) [the original edition includes the first ten lines of homily IX but these were omitted in the reprint]; Paul E. Szarmach, *Vercelli Homilies IX–XXIII*, Centre for Medieval Studies (Toronto, 1981).

[66] Phillip Pulsiano, *An Annotated Bibliography of North American Doctoral Dissertations on Old English Language and Literature*, (East Lansing, MI, 1988), pp. 265–74.

[67] Janet Bately, *Anonymous Old English Homilies: A Preliminary Bibliography of Source Studies*, Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies (Binghamton, NY, 1993).

[68] Robert DiNapoli, *An Index of Theme and Image to the Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (Hockwold cum Wilton, Norfolk, 1995).

established goes a long way towards clarifying links between homilies which are generally accepted as "anonymous," it cannot include material which has been added to (or subtracted from) authored homilies until such time as these are included, as they may be ultimately. Ælfric effectively "published" his first two sets of homilies when they were sent to Archbishop Sigeric around 990 A.D., and they remained popular until the middle of the twelfth century.[69] For thirty years, Ælfric himself rewrote them, and after his death many other writers used his material as a source for different homilies, with the material sometimes being rethought rather than merely rehearsed. These adapted texts should all be counted as part of the anonymous corpus. And my examples of changes to both Ælfric and to the anonymous homilies themselves shows how that corpus grew, particularly the changes displayed to the item which we call for simplicity Vercelli XIX. Implicit in this is a plea for the revised nomenclature to be published soon. A secondary aim of this discussion, however, has been to suggest ways in which the ECHOE database might be made more useful by the addition of other features which will enhance it as a resource. But ultimately we must always bear in mind that an electronic corpus is dependent upon the life-span of the system used to create it. Electronic systems change over a period of time and their creators themselves move on to other work. What will ultimately endure is hard-copy material, and the by-products that the electronic resource delivers. The intellectual energy that goes into the production of this resource will live in the work that the community of medievalists derives from it. Long may that thrive.

[69] See the essay by Mary Swan referred to above in the Swan and Treharne collection listed in n. 62.

L1 Sourcing Old English Anonymous Homilies: The Pioneers (Max Förster, Rudolph Willard, and J. E. Cross)

Charles D. Wright

A crucial contribution of the ECHOE project will be its database of the Latin sources of Old English anonymous homilies, under the direction of Thomas N. Hall. The database aims to make new contributions to the on-going effort to identify those sources, but it is probably safe to say that there are fewer new Latin sources to be discovered than have already been discovered. Inevitably, then, the sources database will to a considerable extent be a retrospective one. Even the systematic recording of previous discoveries at the micro-level of words, phrases, and sentences, however, will be a formidable task, and it will also require the systematic updating of those discoveries—many of them made over a century ago—not only to reflect the most recent editions of and scholarship on the source texts themselves, but also to incorporate manuscript evidence for their transmission and variation as these may affect assessments of the forms in which vernacular homilists had access to the sources. Some important preliminary work compiling the results of previous source scholarship has been done and will be of great value to the ECHOE project: Adam Dunbar McCoy has listed the major source discoveries down to the early 1970s;[1] Janet Bately has compiled an essential bibliography of source scholarship on the anonymous homilies (excluding those for the

[1] McCoy, "The Use of the Writings of English Authors in Old English Homiletic Literature" (PhD diss., Cornell University, 1973), Appendix I: "The Homilies and Their Sources," pp. 176–238.

Sanctorale) down to 1990;[2] *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* has closely sourced a few dozen of the nearly three hundred homilies that survive;[3] and *Sources of Old English and Anglo-Latin Literary Culture* (formerly *SASLC*) has contributed surveys of a number of their source texts and authors.[4] These resources provide essential points-of-entry to much of the relevant data—the sources that have been discovered, and the scholarship on them—but there is still no discursive historiography of source scholarship that traces the development of this important contribution to our discipline. The present essay[5] makes a start in that direction by focusing on the pioneering work of three scholars whose consecutive careers spanned a century, from the 1890s to the 1990s: Max Förster, Rudolph Willard, and J. E. Cross. The combined discoveries made by these three scholars account for the bulk of the Latin sources known

---

[2] Bately, *Anonymous Old English Homilies: A Preliminary Bibliography of Source Studies*, Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies (Binghamton, NY, 1993). Bately does not specify the actual sources identified for the homilies.

[3] *Fontes*, online at http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk. Accessed 31 July 2018. For anonymous homilies one must browse through the entries listed under "Anglo-Saxon Author: ANON (OE)." Specific *Fontes* entries cited below were all accessed in September 2018.

[4] The *SASLC* Project (now renamed as *SOEALLC*) has resulted in a number of publications that cover source texts and authors relevant to the corpus of Old English anonymous homilies, including *A Trial Version* (Binghamton, NY, 1990); Volume 1: *Abbo of Fleury, Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and Acta Sanctorum*, ed. Frederick M. Biggs, Thomas D. Hill, Paul E. Szarmach, and E. Gordon Whatley, with the assistance of Deborah A. Oosterhouse (Kalamazoo, MI, 2001); and *The Apocrypha*, ed. Frederick M. Biggs, Instrumenta Anglistica Mediaevalia 1 (Kalamazoo, MI, 2007).

[5] This historiography was originally intended to form part of my essay "Old English Homilies and Latin Sources," which appeared in *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. Aaron J Kleist, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17 (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 15–66. For reasons of length I was able to use only parts of several paragraphs, which for sake of continuity are included here in lightly revised form. I am grateful to Professor Thomas N. Hall for allowing me to consult his draft "Handlist of Old English Sermons and Homilies" and for his comments on this paper, as well as to Stephen Pelle for a number of corrections.

today, and the methodologies they developed fundamentally defined the practice of source scholarship for its first century and beyond. My intention is not simply to enumerate these scholars' major discoveries, but also to elucidate the significance of their work for our understanding of the relation of vernacular homilies to Latin sources, and to draw out the implications of their methods and assumptions for the development of source scholarship in Old English studies. I will therefore also be referring to more recent work that has supplemented or corrected the work of these three pioneers. At the same time, while more recent source scholarship has advanced in precision and sophistication, thanks both to new tools and new approaches, even current scholarship as exemplified in the present volume has been deeply informed by the procedures established by these three pioneers in the field.

The pioneers themselves, of course, had predecessors. Even before any precise sources had been identified, scattered quotations in Old English homilies of Latin phrases or incipits and references to patristic authorities such as Augustine had alerted scholars to their use of Latin sources—as might also have been deduced from the homilies' sometimes unidiomatic, Latinate syntax, or indeed assumed on antecedent historical grounds. Already in 1851 Charles Goodwin had drawn attention to Latin sentences quoted in Blickling XVIII on Saint Andrew (LS 1.2 [AndrewMor]) as evidence that the homily was a translation.[6] Richard Morris's edition of the Blickling Homilies (1874–80)[7] and Arthur S. Napier's of homilies attributed to Wulfstan (1883),[8] the first major editions of anonymous homilies, failed to identify any Latin

[6] Goodwin, *The Anglo-Saxon Legends of St. Andrew and St. Veronica*, Cambridge Antiquarian Society, Octavo Series 1 (Cambridge, 1851), p. vi.

[7] See *BH*. See now also the edition of Richard J. Kelly, *The Blickling Homilies* (London, 2003), which, however, is inadequate in a number of ways.

[8] See Napier.

sources, but their publication was a major impetus for source scholarship in the following decades.

By 1886, Julius Zupitza had identified the ultimate Greek source of the Andrew homily which is also transmitted, and in more complete form, in CCCC 198 (LS 1.1 [AndrewBright]).[9] Zupitza (1844–1895)[10] was arguably the founder of modern source scholarship on the Old English homily, for he published two of the earliest papers devoted specifically to the sources of anonymous homilies and he supervised Förster's dissertation on the sources of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*.[11] If Förster's contributions were ultimately far more significant, his methods undoubtedly reflected those of his teacher. Zupitza's 1898 essay "Zu 'Seele und Leib'" is a classic of comparative source analysis.[12] Zupitza demonstrated that two Old English Soul-and-Body homilies, the so-called "Macarius Homily" (HomU 55) and

---

[9] Zupitza, "Zur frage nach der quelle von Cynewulfs Andreas," *ZfdA* 30 (1886),176–81. Zupitza (p. 181), noting that medieval vernacular homilists often quoted bits of their Latin sources, disputed Goodwin's assumption that the Latin quotation in Blicking XVIII was due to "inadvertence."

[10] Eugen Kölbing, "Julius Zupitza. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der englischen Philologie in Deutschland," *Englische Studien* 21 (1895), 452–71, and 22 (1896), 162, with a complete bibliography of Zupitza's publications, which ended prematurely with his sudden death at age 51. Another of Zupitza's students was A. S. Napier, whose memorial tributes to Zupitza appeared in *The Academy* 1121 (20 July 1895), 51, and (with Max Roediger) in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 95 (1895), 241–58. In a number of studies, Richard J. Utz has examined Zupitza's Middle English scholarship in relation to the preoccupations of nineteenth-century German philology. See especially Utz, *Chaucer and the Discourse of German Philology: A History of Reception and an Annotated Bibliography of Studies, 1793–1948*, Making the Middle Ages 3 (Turnhout, 2002), pp. 73–82.

[11] Zupitza also felt free, as editor of the journal *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* (henceforth *Archiv*), to insert various footnotes of his own (initialed "J. Z.") in Förster's essay on the Blickling Homilies, even disputing his student on various minor points.

[12] Zupitza, "Zu 'Seele und Leib'," *Archiv* 91 (1893), 369–404.

Napier XXIX (HomU 26), Zupitza's **Th** and **N** respectively,[13] were closely related to a Latin sermon in a Nonantola manuscript (Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale 2096 (52), Zupitza's **B**) printed by Theodor Batiouchkof in his 1891 study of the medieval debate of the body and soul.[14] After printing the three texts in parallel columns, Zupitza systematically isolated, first, material in **B** lacking in **Th** and **N** and conversely material in **Th** and **N** lacking in **B**, then readings in which **Th** and **N** differ in substance, formulation, or sequence from **B**. Next he considered whether **Th** and **N** are variant copies of the same translation of the Latin "Original," or two independent translations, deciding in favour of the latter because of the substantive differences in wording. That **B** is closely related to their common source he illustrated with Latin readings that account for both **Th** and **N** as well as readings found in either **Th** or **N** alone. Finally, he cited divergent readings that suggested to him that **Th** could not be dependent on **N** or vice versa. Because the two homilies share some material lacking in the Latin (notably a "parenetic" address to the audience) yet both lack the Latin sermon's speech of the good soul, Zupitza posited as their common source a lost Latin sermon closely similar to **B**. Zupitza was not, of course, suggesting that the two homilists consulted the same manuscript copy of this Latin sermon, only that they both consulted copies closely similar, but not identical, to **B**. Additional manuscripts of the Latin sermon have since come to light,[15] and

[13] Benjamin Thorpe's edition of the Macarius Homily cited by Zupitza has been superseded by Hans Sauer's edition in *Theodulfi Capitula in England*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie 8 (Munich, 1978), pp. 411–16 (with nn. at pp. 468–70). See also the edition of Rosa Zaffuto, "Edizione e analisi dell'omelia 'Ic bidde *and* eadmodlice lære men þa leofestan' (ms. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201)" (Ph.D. diss., University of Rome III, 1999), which includes very full commentary on the eschatological themes in HomU 55 and its parallels in other Old English homilies.

[14] Batiouchkof, "Le débat du corps et de l'âme," *Romania* 20 (1891), 576–78.

[15] Another copy was printed by Louise Dudley, *The Egyptian Elements in the Legend of Body and Soul*, Bryn Mawr College Monographs 8 (Baltimore, 1911), pp. 225–53, who noted that a fuller version also survives as

Zupitza's conclusions have been challenged by Karl Jost.[16] Moreover, Zupitza did not consider the possibility that the parenetic passage lacking in the Latin might have been drawn, not from a lost Latin source, but from another Old English homily, as indeed has since been

---

Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 69 *Ad fratres in eremo* (PL 40:1355–57). Dudley helpfully printed these two versions in parallel in an earlier article, "An Early Homily on the 'Body and Soul' Theme," *JEGP* 8 (1909), 225–53. Two more texts were printed by Jean Leclercq, "Deux anciennes versions de la légende de l'Abbé Macaire," *Revue Mabillon* 36 (1946), 64–79. On the relationships of these versions see Justin Brent, "The Legend of the Soul and Body in Medieval England" (PhD diss., SUNY Stony Brook, 2000), pp. 66 ff. For translations of the Nonantola sermon as well as of the Pseudo-Augustine *Sermo* 49 and the similar Pseudo-Augustine *Sermo* 58 see Michael J. B. Allen and Daniel G. Calder, *Sources and Analogues of Old English Poetry: The Major Latin Texts in Translation* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 40–50.

[16] Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten 23 (Berne, 1950), pp. 206–7. Jost argued that, despite the omission of the speech of the good soul, the two homilies are textually very close to the Nonantola sermon, which he would see as a late copy of the immediate source for the Macarius Homily. Jost further argued that the Macarius Homily is in fact the source of Napier XXIX, whose compiler lightly revised what he borrowed and did not have independent access to the Latin. Jost's main evidence was that all the longer passages in **B** omitted by **Th** are also omitted by **N**, and that **Th** is closer to **B** in all but a few readings, which he would account for by assuming that N had access to a better copy of **Th**. Jost apparently did not consult the texts printed by Dudley and Leclercq, however, and Brent ("The Legend of the Soul and Body in Medieval England," pp. 91–92) has concluded that he overstated the similarities between **Th** and **N**, though Brent believes that both probably derive from an earlier Old English translation. Zaffuto, "Edizioni e analisi," pp. 150–58, likewise argues for their independent derivation from a lost sermon related to the Nonantola sermon and *Sermo ad fratres in eremo* 69. See also Dorothy Ina Haines, "Rhetorical Strategies in Old English Prose" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1998), pp. 109–13. Charles D. Wright, "The Old English 'Macarius' Homily, Vercelli Homily IV, and Ephraem the Syrian's *De paenitentia*," in *Via Crucis: Studies in Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross*, ed. Thomas D. Hill, Thomas N. Hall, and Charles D. Wright, Medieval European Studies 1 (Morgantown, WVa, 2002), p. 213; and Claudia Di Sciacca, "The 'Ubi Sunt' Motif and the Soul-and-Body Legend in Old English Homilies: Sources and Relationships," *JEGP* 105 (2006), 369–70.

demonstrated.[17] Nonetheless, Zupitza's identification of **B** as a source (whether immediate or at one remove) for the Macarius Homily remains fundamental, and his method of isolating verbal parallels and discrepancies was sound, even if the evidence defined in this way has been susceptible to other interpretations.

The 1890s marked the beginning of an era of discovery that continued unabated for nearly a century, and was dominated by the three scholars whose work I will focus on in this essay. An essential precondition for the rapid progress of source scholarship was a readily accessible printed corpus of patristic and early medieval Christian-Latin literature, and this had been supplied in the mid-nineteenth century by Jacques-Paul Migne's monumental if maddeningly makeshift Patrologia Latina (1844–55), consisting of 217 double-columned folio volumes reprinting editions dating from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries, and supplemented by four volumes of elaborate indices (1862–65) that enabled one to locate Latin sermons and homilies for particular feasts, as well as commentaries on particular biblical books and passages and treatises on particular moral or doctrinal subjects.[18] Until the advent of the searchable electronic Chadwyck-Healey PL and the *CETEDOC Library of Christian-*

[17] See Scragg, "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric," *ASE* 8 (1979), 102, 105, and 144, n. 162; also Claudia Di Sciacca, "Due note a tre omelie anglosassoni sul tema dell'anima e il corpo," in *Antichità Germaniche: II Parte*, ed. Vittoria Dolcetti Corazza and Renato Gendre, Biblioteca Germanica, Studi e Testi 12 (Alessandria, 2002), pp. 223–50.

[18] On Migne's publishing enterprise see R. Howard Bloch, *God's Plagiarist: Being an Account of the Fabulous Industry and Irregular Commerce of the Abbé Migne* (Chicago, 1995); Adalbert Hamman, "Les principaux collaborateurs des deux patrologies de Migne," in *Migne et le renouveau des études patristiques*, ed. A. Mandouze and J. Fouilheron, Théologie historique 66 (Paris, 1985), pp. 179–91. Citations of the PL in source scholarship are at times bedevilled by the existence of reprints by both Migne and the publisher Garnier Frères, as well as by a second edition by Garnier that resulted in changes in the column-numbering of certain texts. As a rule, citations should be to the first edition.

Latin Texts databases in the 1990s, a painstaking and intimate familiarity with the PL and its indices was an indispensable skill for a source-scholar.[19] Equipped with the PL, supplemented with other major primary-text series such as Acta Sanctorum (1643–1940), Monumenta Germaniae Historica (1826–), and Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (1866–), Zupitza's student, the prolific and indefatigable Max Förster, was able to identify the major sources of many of the Blickling and Vercelli homilies as well as of the *Catholic Homilies* and *Lives of Saints* by Ælfric, almost single-handedly defining source-scholarship for the first modern generation of Old English scholars. The next revolution in source scholarship—just underway at the time of Cross's death in 1996—would be sparked by the availability of these same Latin text corpora in searchable online databases, and by the proliferation of online digital facsimiles of manuscripts.

L2 Max Förster

Max Förster (1868–1954)[20] taught successively at Bonn, Würzburg, Halle, and finally at Munich, where he was forced into retirement by the Nazis in 1934. He subsequently took up a

[19] On the value and deficiencies of the PL from the viewpoint of a medievalist and source scholar writing before the advent of the Chadwyck-Healey PL database, online at http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk (accessed 2019 July 10), see R. E. Kaske, *Medieval Christian Literary Imagery: A Guide to Interpretation*, Toronto Medieval Bibliographies 11 (Toronto, 1988), pp. 9–11. On the revolutionary impact on source scholarship of the *CETEDOC Library of Latin Texts*, online at http://www.brepolis.net (accessed 2019 July 10), see Thomas D. Hill, "CETEDOC and the Transformation of Anglo-Saxon Studies," *OEN* 26.1 (1992), 46–48.

[20] For Förster's biography see especially Hans Sauer, "Max Förster (1869–1954)," in *Medieval Scholarship: Biographical Studies on the Formation of a Discipline: Literature and Philology*, vol. 2: *Literature and Philology*, ed. Helen Damico, Garland Reference Library of the Humanities 2071 (New York, 1998), pp. 339–50, and the obituary by Rudolph Willard, "Max Förster. 8 March 1869–10 November 1954," *RES* n.s. 6 (1955), 273–79.

two-year visiting professorship at Yale, but he returned to Munich after the end of World War II from 1945 until 1949. Förster, whose published work first appeared in the 1890s and spanned the entire first half of the twentieth century,[21] was not content to raid the PL, but ranged far in both the mainstream and the byways of patristic and medieval Latin literatures, sometimes consulting unpublished manuscript sources.[22] In addition to identifying patristic sources (notably in the *Homiliae in Evangelia* of Gregory the Great), Förster also drew attention to the use of biblical apocrypha (including the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew* and the *Apocalypse of Thomas*) by Old English anonymous homilists. Förster's work, as we shall see, concentrated on the editorial and philological uses of Latin sources, but these discoveries often also led Förster to devalue the originality and literary quality of the anonymous homilies, especially in relation to the homilies of Ælfric. His 1892 dissertation had sourced some two-dozen of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*,[23] and he followed up in 1894 with a study

[21] For Förster's Old English literary scholarship see Stanley Greenfield and Fred C. Robinson, *A Bibliography of Publications on Old English Literature from the Beginnings to the End of 1972* (Toronto, 1980). For fuller bibliographies of his writings see *Britannica. Max Förster zum sechzigsten geburtstage: 1869 8. märz 1929* (Leipzig, 1929); and especially Herbert Schöffler, *Veröffentlichungen Max Försters anlässlich seines 70. geburtstages am 8. märz 1939*, Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten 35 (Bochum, 1939), indexing those on Old English at p. 86, supplemented by Theodor Göhler, "Das Spätwerk Max Försters: Eine Bibliographie," *Anglia* 74 (1956), 416–26, who also lists other obituaries. For Förster's *Nachlass* at the BSB, Munich, see *BSB OPACplus* at https://opacplus.bsb-muenchen.de/search?oclcno=775079290&View=default&db=100&View=default. Accessed 2019 July 11.

[22] In addition to discovering sources for many individual homilies, Förster also investigated the sources of certain themes or motifs that occur in or are alluded to in Old English homilies. See, for example, "Die Weltzeitalter bei den Angelsachsen," in *Neusprachliche Studien: Festgabe Karl Luick zu seinem sechzigsten Geburstage*, ed. Friedrich Wild, Die Neueren Sprachen 6 (Marburg, 1925), pp. 183–203.

[23] Förster, "Über die Quellen von Ælfric's Homiliae Catholicae. I. Legenden," Inaugural-Dissertation, Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität Bonn (Berlin, 1892).

sourcing a large number of Ælfric's exegetical *Catholic Homilies*.[24] Förster's scholarship on Old English anonymous homilies was of a comparable scale.[25] One of his earliest contributions, "Zu den Blickling Homilies," published in 1893,[26] begins with a disarming concession of Förster's failure to have located Latin sources for *all* the homilies in the manuscript. He did, however, manage to discover the major Latin sources for no fewer than seven of them (II, III, IV, XV, and XVI–XVIII [= XVII–XIX in Morris's numbering]), and within a few years he followed up with identifications of sources for Blickling VII and XIV.[27] Among the homilies sourced by Förster was Blickling XVIII on Saint Andrew, which Zupitza had compared to the original Greek *Acts of Andrew and Matthias in the City of the Cannibals*, though he realised that the homilist's immediate source must have been a lost Latin translation. Förster showed that a fragmentary Latin translation that had recently been discovered (though not yet published) by Max Bonnet was a close approximation to the Blickling homilist's lost immediate source; and Förster also drew attention to another independent and complete Latin translation in a Vatican manucript, which, though not the

[24] Förster, "Über die Quellen von Ælfrics exegetischen Homiliae Catholicae," *Anglia* 16 (1894), 1–61.

[25] The Author Index to Bately's *Anonymous Old English Homilies*, p. 73, lists twenty-eight homilies under Förster's name. These do not include Förster's source discoveries for the homiletic Lives of Saints: for the homily on Saint Quintin (LS 33), see "Zur altenglischen Quintinus-Legende," *Archiv* 106 (1901), 258–61; for Blickling XV (Peter and Paul), Blickling XVII/Vercelli XVIII (Martin), Blickling XVIII (Andrew), and Blickling XVI (Archangel Michael), see "Zu den Blickling Homilies"; for Blickling XIV (John the Baptist), see "Altenglische Predigtquellen. II.," *Archiv* 122 (1909), 246–56.

[26] Förster, "Zu den Blickling Homilies," *Archiv* 91 (1893), 179–206.

[27] For Blickling XIV, see n. 25; for Blickling VII, see "Altenglische Predigtquellen. I.," *Archiv* 116 (1906), 301–7. In 1899 Förster published a separate note on Blickling IV that drew attention to its use of the *Visio Pauli*: "Zur vierten Blickling Homily," *Archiv* 103 (1899), 149; see Mark Atherton, "The Sources of Blickling Homily 4 (Cameron B.3.2.14)," *Fontes* (1996). Some four decades later, Förster returned to the sources of Blickling VII in an essay on the Old English versions of the *Apocalypse of Thomas* (see below, p. 000).

source of the Old English, agreed with it on several points against the Greek and Syriac versions.[28] By comparing the two copies of the Old English homily with these Latin versions, Förster was able to show that, while the fragmentary text in Blickling XVIII is generally superior, the text in CCCC 198 preserves a number of original readings. Förster was unaware, however, of the Casanatensis Latin translation, first edited in 1917 and re-edited in 1930,[29] which is much closer to the Greek (and to the homilist's lost Latin source) than is the Vatican text, and accordingly the *Fontes* entry for Blickling XVIII (= Morris XIX) cites the Casanatensis instead.[30]

Förster's stunning contribution of 1893 on the Blickling Homilies exemplifies the tendency of early source scholars to focus almost exclusively on the value of the Latin source for construing and emending the Old English text. Devoting a section to each newly-sourced

---

[28] Förster, "Zu den Blickling Homilies," 202–5. Förster printed the entire Vallicelliana fragment, which was subsequently published by Bonnet, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha* II/1 (Leipzig, 1898), pp. 85–88. In 1930 a critical edition of all the Latin translations was published by Franz Blatt (who failed to notice Förster's discussion of the Vatican manuscript version): *Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropophagos*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 12 (Giessen, 1930), cf. pp. 3 and 13–14.

[29] See Blatt, *Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen*, pp. 33–95 (text of the Casanatensis on facing pages with the *Praxeis*; Blatt, p. 3, refers to the earlier edition by Moricca). The first Old English scholar to exploit Blatt's edition for source analysis of the Old English homily as well as the poem *Andreas* seems to have been Claes Scharr, *Critical Studies in the Cynewulf Group*, Lund Studies in English 17 (Lund, 1949), whose comparison of the Greek, Latin, and Old English versions (pp. 12–24) remains valuable. Robert Boenig, *The Acts of Andrew in the Country of the Cannibals: Translations from the Greek, Latin, and Old English*, Garland Library of Medieval Literature, Series B, 70 (New York, 1991), translates the *Praxeis*, Casanatensis, and Bonnet Fragment, but not the Vatican version.

[30] Susan Rosser, "The Sources of Blicking Homily 19 (Cameron B.3.3.1)," *Fontes* (2000). Since the Latin translation used by the homilist has not been recovered, the *Fontes* entry is necessarily a patchwork, with three records citing the "Bonnet Fragment"; forty-six citing the Casanatensis; and eight citing the Greek *Praxeis*.

homily, Förster typically characterised the degree of literalness of the translation ("fast wörtlich" in most cases) before proceeding to an analysis of specific passages where the Latin source shed some light on the syntax or vocabulary of the Old English, or helped to restore the original wording of corrupt passages. Morris's edition had been prepared without benefit of knowledge of any of the homilies' Latin sources, and Förster was able to improve dramatically upon Morris's texts and translations, by repunctuating, by emending, and by determining the likely meaning of obscure Old English words. The remarkable success of this approach encouraged a conviction that the Latin source provided a key to the meaning of the Old English, and even emboldened Förster to fill brief lacunae—sometimes detected only through comparison with the Latin, though often coinciding with broken syntax or *non sequitur* in the Old English—with his own "Old English" translations of the Latin source. That Förster regarded the Old English as essentially determined by the Latin was evident from his shorthand use of the equals sign (=) to link quotations of parallel passages.

Förster's research on the sources of the Vercelli Homilies was conducted as part of a planned critical edition that was never completed. In 1913 Förster published five of the homilies (nos. II, VI, IX, XV, and XX) with an introduction that included descriptions of all twenty-three.[31] The first part of his edition of the entire set, covering Homilies I–VIII (together with the first page of his edition of Homily IX), appeared in 1932 in the series Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, but proofs of the second part were destroyed in World War II (during which time Förster also lost almost his entire personal library).[32]

[31] "Der Vercelli-Codex CXVII nebst Abdruck einiger altenglischer Homilien der Handschrift," in *Festschrift für Lorenz Morsbach*, ed. F. Holthausen and H. Spies, Studien zur englischen Philologie 1 (Halle, 1913), pp. 20–179; also published separately with repagination.

[32] Förster, *Die Vercelli-Homilien zum ersten Male herausgegeben*, BaP 12 (Hamburg, 1932; repr. Darmstadt, 1964).

In the 1913 edition Förster was able to identify Latin sources for substantial portions of homilies VI, XV, and XX, and for a brief section of XIX (having already identified the sources of Vercelli XVIII and Blickling XVII on Saint Martin). Förster's discovery of Latin sources for Vercelli VI and XV was significant not only for textual criticism (as are all source discoveries) but also for intellectual history, affording evidence of the important contribution of apocryphal texts to the formation of Christian culture in pre-Conquest England. Between 1851 and 1876 many early Christian apocrypha had been printed by Konstantin von Tischendorf.[33] Using Tischendorf's edition of the apocryphal Gospels, Förster demonstrated that the second part of Vercelli VI concerning the Flight into Egypt translates several chapters from the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*.[34] Frederick M. Biggs, however, drawing on Jan Gisjel's 1997 critical edition of *Pseudo-Matthew*, has noted that Tischendorf's text represents a late version of the apocryphon with several chapters (chs. 25–42 in Tischendorf) based on the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* that were excluded from Gisjel's text, and according to Biggs the apparent echoes of chs. 25 and 42 in Vercelli VI are highly doubtful, depending probably on

[33] Tischendorf, *Acta Apostolorum apocrypha* (Leipzig, 1851); *Evangelia apocrypha* (Leipzig, 1853; 2nd ed., 1876); *Apocalypses apocryphae: Mosis, Esdrae, Pauli, Johannis, item Mariae Dormitio: additis Evangeliorum et actuum Apocryphorum supplementis* (Leipzig, 1866).

[34] Gijsel, *Libri de nativitate Mariae: Pseudo-Matthaei Evangelium, textus et commentarius*, CCSA 9 (Turnhout, 1997). Förster's discovery was incorporated in the later editions by Paul Szarmach, *The Vercelli Homilies, IX–XXIII*, Toronto Old English Series 5 (Toronto, 1981) and D. G. Scragg, *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, EETS o.s. 300 (Oxford, 1992), as well as in Mark Atherton, "The Sources of Vercelli Homily 6 (Cameron B.3.4.10)," *Fontes* (1996). For a recent overview of the scholarship on the transmission of *Pseudo-Matthew* in pre-Conquest England see the entry on that work by Thomas N. Hall in *SASLC*: *The Apocrypha*, pp. 23–25. Scragg's edition, pp. 130–31, also cites Tischendorf's text of *Pseudo-Matthew*, as does the 1996 *Fontes* entry. On the complicated recensional history of *Pseudo-Matthew* see Rita Beyers, "The Transmission of Marian Apocrypha in the Latin Middle Ages," *Apocrypha* 23 (2012), 115–38.

biblical verses rather than on *Pseudo-Matthew*, and thus not affording evidence that the additions in Tischendorf's text were already in circulation in England in the tenth century.[35] The precise textual affiliations of those sections of Vercelli VI that undoubtedly do depend on *Pseudo-Matthew* have yet to be fully investigated; but the starting point will always be Förster's initial source discovery, even though the edition he cited has been superseded and some of his conclusions have inevitably been modified.[36]

Förster was also the first to recognise that Vercelli XV incorporates an Old English version of the *Apocalypse of Thomas*, an early-Christian account of the signs of the seven days preceding the Day of Judgement, Latin texts of which (in shorter, longer, and abbreviated recensions) had only recently been rediscovered. In his 1913 edition Förster supplemented his text of Vercelli XV with the text of another Old English translation in a homily in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116 (HomS 44 = Bazire-Cross III) (at that time he was unaware of a second copy of this homily in CCCC 162 (HomS 33). Förster had access to proof sheets of an edition of the *Apocalypse of Thomas* by Ernst von Dobschütz that was intended for the series *Texte und Untersuchungen* but was never actually published.[37] Förster

[35] Biggs, "Vercelli Homily 6 and the Apocryphal *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*," *N&Q* n.s. (2002), 176–78.

[36] On the use of *Pseudo-Matthew* in Vercelli VI see generally Brandon Hawk, *Preaching Apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England* (Toronto, 2018), pp. 139–58. Mary Clayton, *The Apocryphal Gospels of Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*, CSASE 26 (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 136–41, discusses the textual affiliations of the Old English homily on the Nativity of Mary (LS 18, ed. Clayton, pp. 164–90) that incorporates a translation of *Pseudo-Matthew*, chs. 1–12, but her brief discussion of Vercelli VI does not deal with its specific affiliations. I am grateful to Brandon Hawk for discussing with me the current status of scholarship on Vercelli VI and *Pseudo-Matthew*.

[37] These proofs included only diplomatic transcripts of the texts known to Dobschütz; his hand-written critical edition was never completed, in part due to P. Bihlmeyer's independent discovery of the shorter or "non-Interpolated" version. See Charles D. Wright, "Some New Versions of *The Apocalypse of Thomas* and Their Significance for the Old English Versions," in *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. D.

attempted to approximate the homilist's source with a composite Latin text of the *Apocalypse of Thomas* based mainly on one manuscript of the longer recension, but with selected variants of other manuscripts in brackets where they afforded closer parallels; conjectural emendations made to match up with the Old English translation were highlighted typographically.[38] The "editing" of such composite Latin texts, the sole purpose of which is to approximate the wording of the lost manuscript presumed to underlie an Old English target text, became a standard practice for source scholars and editors of Old English homilies (see below, pp. 000 and 000). It was left to D. G. Scragg in his 1992 edition of the Vercelli Homilies to combine the material from the two composite texts printed by Förster into a complete source apparatus for Vercelli XV.[39] Scragg's plain-text version of Förster's composite apocalypse, which omitted Förster's brackets and sigla indicating which readings were from which manuscripts, as well as the italics marking Förster's own conjectural emendations, was in turn the basis of Mark Atherton's *Fontes* entry,[40] which inevitably has the same limitations.

G. Scragg and Kathryn Powell, MANCASS 2 (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 28–29. I am preparing a critical edition of the Latin texts of the *Apocalypse of Thomas* for CCSA, making use of Dobschütz's unpublished edition as well as a number of additional manuscripts, and a collective edition of the Old English homilies that are based on the *Apocalypse of Thomas* (Vercelli XV; HomU 12; Blickling VII; and Bazire-Cross III [HomS 44/HomS 33 = Förster's "Corpus-Hatton" homily]).

[38] Förster's edition of Hatton 116 included, in lieu of an *apparatus fontium*, a text of those passages in Blickling VII that correspond to the *Apocalypse of Thomas*; and in a footnote (p. 116 [132] n. 3) he printed a composite Latin text of the *Apoclaypse of Thomas* for the signs of the fifth day that were omitted in Vercelli XV and so not included in his *apparatus fontium* for that homily.

[39] *VH*, pp. 250–65.

[40] Atherton, "The Sources of Vercelli Homily 15 (Cameron B.3.4.6)," *Fontes* (1996).

Rudolph Willard, in his 1935 study of the Old English *Seven Heavens* and *Three Utterances* apocrypha,[41] had first drawn attention to the version of the *Apocalypse of Thomas* within an anonymous homily in CCCC 41 (HomU 12), but he never published a planned complete edition (see below, pp. 000). It was left to Förster two decades later to publish that part of the CCCC 41 homily, Willard having separately published the second part of the homily based on the *Seven Heavens* apocryphon.[42] In his 1955 (posthumously published) edition,[43] Förster printed a more elaborate composite Latin text, including readings from two additional manuscripts, but now keyed to the CCCC 41 homily. He also revisited the three other Old English versions, and printed selected Latin variants relevant for them, including Vercelli XV; but he did not include those portions of the "interpolated" Introduction of the longer version of the *Apocalypse of Thomas* that were not translated by the CCCC 41 homilist. Thus the composite text in the 1913 edition is not a complete record of the variants (since Förster was not then aware of two further manuscripts), while the composite text in the 1955 article skips over a substantial portion of the interpolated Introduction that was translated by the Vercelli homilist. As in the case of the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*, more recently discovered texts of the *Apocalypse of Thomas* have enabled refinements to Förster's

---

[41] Willard, *Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies*, Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 30 (Leipzig, 1935), p. 2.

[42] The *DOE List of Texts* has three short titles for this homily: HomU 12.1 (Först) and HomU 12.2 (Willard) refer respectively to the separately published *Apocalypse of Thomas* and *Seven Heavens* parts of the homily, while HomU 12.3 (CCCC 41) refers to the brief conclusion not published by either Förster or Willard. The *Seven Heavens* part has been re-edited together with the conclusion by Nicole Volmering, "The Old English Account of the Seven Heavens," in *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, ed. John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 2 vols., Celtic Studies Publications 17 (Aberystwyth, 2014), 1:285–306. On the *Seven Heavens* see further below, p. 000.

[43] Förster, "A New Version of *The Apocalypse of Thomas* in Old English," *Anglia* 73 (1955), 6–36. This was to be the last of his 861 publications as enumerated by Schöffler and Göhler.

reconstructed composite source for Vercelli XV and CCCC 41, but they have also introduced new complications regarding the affiliations of Blickling VII and what Förster now called the Corpus-Hatton homily (HomS 44/HomS 33 = Bazire-Cross III).[44]

In his 1932 edition of Vercelli Homilies I–VIII, Förster identified additional Latin sources for Vercelli III in Alcuin's *Liber de uitiis et uirtutibus* and for Vercelli V in Gregory the Great's *Homiliae in Evangelia*. We now know that Alcuin was an antecedent or ultimate source rather than a direct source for these homilies; this was determined in 1960 and 1963 by Joan Turville-Petre, who showed that the source was a lost Latin penitential homily that was translated independently in Belfour VI (HomS 15) as well as in an Old Icelandic homily.[45] The "lost" Latin homily was subsequently discovered by Helen Spencer in the "Pembroke Homiliary" (Cambridge, Pembroke College 25), also known as the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres,[46] the broader significance of which as a source for Old English anonymous homilists was later recognised and demonstrated in detail by J. E. Cross (see pp. 000–000 below). A vernacular homilist's use of an intermediate source can, however, be difficult or impossible to detect on the basis of internal evidence alone, and Förster was not aware either of the Pembroke 25 homily or of its independent vernacular translations, so he was unable to distinguish between immediate and ultimate or antecedent sources.[47]

---

[44] See Charles D. Wright, "Some New Versions of *The Apocalypse of Thomas*," and "Vercelli Homily XV and *The Apocalypse of Thomas*," in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, TASS 4 (Toronto, 2009), pp. 151–84.

[45] Turville-Petre, "Translations of a Lost Penitential Homily," *Traditio* 19 (1963), 70.

[46] Helen L. Spencer, "Vernacular and Latin Versions of a Sermon for Lent: 'A Lost Penitential Homily' Found," *MS* 44 (1982), 271–305. For details see Mark Atherton, "The Sources of Vercelli Homily 3 (Cameron B.2.3.11)," *Fontes* (1996).

[47] Förster also failed to follow up his own observation that many of the sources he identified for Ælfric were included in the homiliary of Paul the Deacon: "Über die Quellen von Ælfrics exegetischen Homiliae

The subsequent discovery of the immediate source of Vercelli III retrospectively exposed other limitations in the methods of philological and text-critical analysis employed by Förster. Roland Torkar has shown that Förster, relying on the traditional techniques of *recensio* and *examinatio* without benefit of access to the Latin source, often failed to identify the superior (i.e. original) reading among the variants in the four surviving manuscripts of Vercelli III.[48] Comparison with the Pembroke homily enabled Torkar to identify as scribal conjectures several readings that Förster had defended as original, including some *hapax legomena* that had been generated by corruption of well-attested words or phrases corresponding closely to the Latin. Without benefit of what Torkar calls the "Einblick ins stemmatische Jenseits" (that is, beyond the archetype or hyparchetype) afforded by an immediate Latin source, however, editors must still choose between variant readings and attempt conjectural emendations of corrupt passages using principles of analysis similar to Förster's. The discovery of an immediate (or more immediate) Latin source does not, of course, resolve all textual problems, but it often provides a reliable way to distinguish

---

Catholicae," *Anglia* 16 (1894), 58, n. 1. Förster doubted that Ælfric would have translated directly from such compilations, in part because of Ælfric's "grosse selbständigkeit," but also because Ælfric also drew on many other sources that were not included in them. As Hugh Magennis has rightly stressed, later scholarship demonstrating Ælfric's extensive reliance on the homiliary of Paul the Deacon (as well as that of Haimo of Auxerre, and for his *Lives of Saints* on the so-called "Cotton-Corpus Legendary") "brought the study of sources to a new era …": Magennis, "Ælfric Scholarship," in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 18 (Leiden, 2009), p. 25.

[48] Torkar, "Die Ohnmacht der Textkritik, am Beispiel der Ausgaben der dritten Vercelli-Homilie," in *Anglo-Saxonica: Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der englischen Sprache und zur altenglischen Literatur: Festschrift für Hans Schabram zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Klaus Grinda and Claus-Dieter Wetzel (Munich, 1993), pp. 225–50.

authorial readings from scribal ones, or to reconstruct them conjecturally.[49] Förster's assumption that there *was* an authorial original, and that it is the editor's job to reconstruct it—or at least the archetype of the surviving manuscripts—is still shared by many scholars (including Torkar as well as Scragg), but others believe that the authorial "original" is a chimera and that variation is not the debasement but the essence of medieval textuality.[50] Latin sources will of course be more determinative for an editor who views variation as corruption of a lost original and assumes that most Old English homilists translated literally; but it is hard to imagine an editor for whom sources will be irrelevant.

In assessing Förster's source scholarship one must appreciate his position as a pioneer, the first scholar to read many Old English homilies alongside their newly discovered Latin sources. The impact must have been revelatory, and it led Förster to certain historical and literary-critical conclusions. From the homilies' extensive and often close reliance on Latin sources he concluded that the remaining unsourced passages were likely also to have been based on Latin texts (subsequent discoveries by Förster and others have largely vindicated this prediction). Förster's discoveries also led him to form a rather low estimation of the homilies as literature. So far from being original compositions, or even free "literary" adaptations of Latin models, they were for the most part close, often nearly word-for-word translations. Whereas scholars such as Morris and Bernhard Ten Brink had praised the Blickling Homilies

[49] See also Stephen Pelle's contribution to this volume, p. 000.

[50] For a survey of the methodological issues in relation to Anglo-Latin and Old English texts, from the perspective of a scholar who believes it is the duty of the editor to approximate what an author wrote by detecting and correcting scribal errors, see Michael Lapidge, "Textual Criticism and the Literature of Anglo-Saxon England," in *Textual and Material Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Thomas Northcote Toller and the Toller Memorial Lectures*, ed. D. G. Scragg (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 107–36. I discuss some examples of divergent editorial assumptions and practice in relation to Old English anonymous homilies in "Old English Homilies and Latin Sources," pp. 27–31.

for certain literary qualities of style and structure, Förster felt compelled to transfer most of whatever credit was due to their Latin sources. The further and inevitably invidious comparison with Ælfric, already broached by Morris, was facilitated by the Blickling homilists' translations of some of the same Latin texts that Ælfric later translated both more competently and more freely. Thus the Blickling Homilies suffered by comparison not only with the more polished style of their Latin sources but also with the more supple, idiomatic, and independent translations of Ælfric. In Förster's essay one sees the emergence of an evaluative hierarchy of Old English homilies based on their degree of dependence on their Latin sources, ranging from literal to free, and a concomitant hardening of the distinction between the homilies of Ælfric and the anonymous homilies, almost invariably to the detriment of the latter.[51]

Förster's conclusions regarding the Blickling Homilies set the tone for source scholarship in the early decades of the twentieth century. Hermann G. Fiedler, who in 1903 identified a Pseudo-Augustinian sermon *In Natale Domini* as the source for the bulk of Blicking I,[52] was harsh in his estimation of the homilist's Latinity and Old English prose style: "His style, by the side of the Latin original, seems crude and clumsy," Fiedler remarked, and he explicitly endorsed Förster's view that Bernhard Ten Brink's praise of the Blickling

[51] "Soweit ich Vorlagen habe nachweisen können, trat mir überall ein scharfer Unterschied der Übersetzungsweise zwischen den Blickling Homilies und Ælfrics Sammlungen entgegen: die Übersetzungstechnik zeigt sich in ersteren viel weniger ausgebildet; der Übersetzer haftet noch fast ängstlich an der Vorlage, die er, ohne Kritik an den Inhalt zu legen und ohne sich Zusätze zu gestatten, fast Wort für Wort wiederzugeben bestrebt ist" (Förster, "Zu den Blickling Homilies," 179–80). In "Altenglische Predigtquellen. II.," 246, Förster characterises Blickling XIV as "eine meist ganz wörtliche, fast sklavische und nicht immer richtige Übersetzung."

[52] Fiedler, "The Source of the First Blickling Homily," *MLQ* 6 (1903), 122–24, and Mary Clayton, "The Sources of Blickling Homily 1 (Cameron B.3.4.18), " *Fontes* (1996). For more on Fiedler's assessment of Blickling I see Wright, "Old English Homilies and Latin Sources," pp. 55–56.

Homilies' literary qualities had been misapplied, if not misguided (p. 123). Fiedler concluded that the homily is "nothing but a literal translation of the Latin" and that—to make matters worse—the homilist "frequently misunderstood his original" (pp. 123 and 124).

The work of Förster on the Blickling and Vercelli Homilies inevitably reflected the preoccupations of Old English scholarship at the time. Philological and editorial considerations largely determined the nature of the questions asked, which rarely extended to the homilies' doctrinal or moral contents, or to the aesthetic purposes, social implications, or ideological motivations for a homilist's choice and use of his sources, or indeed to the relevance of the resulting translation to an English audience. Discrepancies between the source and the translation were not likely to be probed as evidence for cultural adaptation but were almost invariably attributed to corrupt transmission of either the Latin or the Old English, or both, or to the homilist's failure to understand the Latin. If the sympathetic approach of later critics might too readily ascribe artistry or subtlety to authorial misunderstandings or scribal corruptions, the tendency of the first generation of source scholars to assume textual corruption or authorial incompetence too readily preempted consideration of the possibility that homilists might deliberately alter a source to facilitate understanding by an English audience, to adapt its contents to different social contexts or intellectual traditions, or to cultivate stylistic effects in the vernacular. Yet the sources identified by Förster—updated as need be by more recent critical editions and studies of a given work's transmission history—remain fundamental to any critical estimation of these homilists' methods of translation, ideological presuppositions, and assumptions about audience.

L2 Rudolph Willard

Förster's successor as the dean of Old English source studies, at least as far as anonymous homilies are concerned, was the Bulgarian-American scholar Rudolph Willard (1892–1979),

who taught first at Yale and then for most of his career at the University of Texas at Austin.[53] Willard was closely associated with Förster, who was Visiting Professor at Yale in 1934–36 (Willard's final two years there) and who published Willard's monograph *Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies* in his series Studien zur englischen Philologie. Willard's published source scholarship spanned the late 1920s through the late 1950s. While his overall scholarly range and output do not bear comparison with Förster's,[54] his contributions in his chosen specialization of anonymous Old English homilies were substantial and lasting, especially in his demonstration of the extensive use of the homilies of Caesarius of Arles and in his discovery of additional Latin sources for popular apocryphal narratives in Old English homilies such as the *Seven Heavens* and *Three Utterances* (as well as his consideration of evidence for the possible transmission of such narratives through Ireland).[55] Willard edited

---

[53] I have consulted a biographical sketch by Ruth Lehmann, Daniel McKeithan, and Ernest Mossner, "In Memoriam Rudolph Willard (29 July 1892 to 28 September 1979)," that was produced at the University of Texas and was formerly available online, but apparently no longer. Thomas Cable (email of 13 September 2018) informs me that at least two boxes of materials belonging to Willard are stored in the attic of the UT English Department, one containing audio tapes (probably of Willard's recordings of African-American preachers), the other containing various photostats, transcriptions, and notes. I am grateful to Professor Cable for rummaging about in the department attic in response to my enquiry about Willard's papers.

[54] For Willard's Old English scholarship, see Greenfield and Robinson, *A Bibliography of Publications on Old English Literature*. Thanks to Professor Cable, I have been able to consult a five-page typescript bibliography held at the University of Texas Library: Daniel Morley McKeithan, "Publications of Rudolph Willard," which lists three monographs, twenty-three articles, one book chapter, and nine book reviews.

[55] The Author Index to Bately's *Anonymous Old English Homilies*, p. 76, lists twenty-six entries under his name, which do not include his studies of the sources of the homilies for the Assumption of the Virgin (Blicking XIII and LS 20.1), for which see below, p. 000. In a largely complimentary review of Willard's monograph *Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies*, C. L. Wrenn said somewhat condescendingly that Willard "has busied himself as a source-hunter in the more obscure and unpublished Anglo-Saxon homilies" (*MÆ* 6 [1937]: 162). At

seven of the Vercelli Homilies for his 1925 Yale dissertation,[56] which has remained largely unconsulted (and virtually inaccessible), though he did publish a series of source discoveries based upon it. Two of his earliest publications, both in 1935, focused on anonymous homilies dealing with the eschatological traditions of the going-out of souls, particular judgement, and the soul's address to the body (the kind of material Willard called "ecclesiastical fiction"). Homilies of this kind often cannot be sourced closely, in some cases because they draw upon an amalgam of unstable multiforms rather than single fixed texts, but also because Latin texts of apocryphal content and dubious authority were continually subject to censorship, and those that have managed to survive to the present day have often gone unnoticed or been improperly identified by manuscript cataloguers more interested in (and more familiar with) mainstream patristic and medieval Latin texts. For all these reasons, vernacular versions of such apocrypha as the *Seven Heavens* or the *Apocalypse of Thomas* may stand a better chance not only of surviving but also of being noticed and edited by modern scholars. In his essay on "The Address of the Soul to the Body,"[57] Willard printed partial editions of two Old English homilies from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 85/86 (HomM 14.1 + HomM 14.2 = Fadda VIII) and CUL Ii. 1. 33 (HomM 8 = Fadda VII), both of which situate the address not at the

---

the time, belle-lettristic attitudes towards literary studies meant that most Old English prose writings other than those attributed to Alfred, Ælfric, or Wulfstan (and perhaps the charms, which had the allure of "magic," not to mention the whiff of paganism) were commonly regarded as of philological interest but of little literary or cultural value. The ECHOE project is eloquent testimony to the extent those attitudes have since broadened, though it remains fashionable to look askance at "source-hunting."

[56] Willard, "The Vercelli Homilies. An Edition of Homilies I, IV, VII, VIII, XI, and XII in Old English Prose from the Vercelli Codex CXVII" (1925). For a brief abstract see Phillip Pulsiano, *An Annotated Bibliography of North American Doctoral Dissertations on Old English Language and Literature*, Medieval Texts and Studies (East Lansing, MI, 1988), pp. 272–73 (no. 873).

[57] *PMLA* 50 (1935), 957–83.

moment of death or the Last Judgement, but at intervals in between (as in the Old English poems *Soul and Body I* and *II*). Willard did not identify any Latin sources for Fadda VIII, but he did note that significant parts of this homily, including much of the souls' speeches as well as an "ex-hortatory section" following them, overlap with Assmann XIV (HomS 6).[58] Noting that the author of Fadda VII invokes "Augustinus" three times as his authority, twice quoting Latin tags, Willard (crediting Eleanor H. Kellogg for one of the discoveries) identified as sources for its first and last sections two separate Pseudo-Augustinian sermons printed in PL 39 and 40, a "rich treasury," as Willard remarked, of such material (p. 961). No such source was forthcoming for the central Soul-and-Body portion of the homily, but a "close variant" of the Latin source for the central section was identified in 1956 by J. E. Cross in a Pseudo-Isidorian sermon.[59] Though Willard was unable to identify close Latin sources for the addresses in the two homilies, his edition was supplemented by a wide-ranging and exacting analysis of these and other Old English Soul-and-Body texts in relation to the times in which they situate the addresses, tracing the development and relationships of all three types in Christian tradition and demonstrating the influence exerted by other eschatological traditions, especially the respite of the damned.[60]

---

[58] For the Latin source of the "ex-hortatory section" in the two homilies see Charles D. Wright, "*Docet Deus, Docet Diabolus*: A Hiberno-Latin Theme in an Old English Body-and-Soul Homily," *N&Q* n.s. 34 (1987), 451–53.

[59] *Sermo* 3 (PL 83:1223–25). See Cross, "'Ubi Sunt' Passages in Old English – Sources and Relationships," *Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund Årsbok* (Lund, 1956), 33–36. See further Kathleen Much Murfin, "An Unedited Old English Homily in MS. Cambridge, U.L. Ii. I33" (MA thesis, Rice University, 1971), and Claudia Di Sciacca, "The *Ubi Sunt* Motif and the Soul-and-Body Legend," 365–68.

[60] When, decades later, Milton McC. Gatch and Antonette DiPaulo Healey surveyed these traditions there was little to add to Willard's findings: Gatch, "Two Uses of Apocrypha in Old English Homilies," *Church History* 33 (1964), 384–87; Healey, *The Old English Vision of Paul*, Speculum Anniversary Monographs 2 (Cambridge,

Willard's 1935 monograph *Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies* included partial editions and source analysis of Old English homilies that draw upon the *Three Utterances*[61] and *Seven Heavens*[62] apocrypha. Here again the surviving Latin texts available at the time did not represent the immediate sources of the Old English versions. Reconstruction of their sources in both cases, however, was assisted (and complicated) by the survival of vernacular Irish analogues. As St. John D. Seymour had pointed out, while the Latin version of the *Seven Heavens* apocryphon is only an epitome, and a fragmentary one at that, several vernacular Irish texts derive independently from fuller, now lost Latin versions of the apocryphon, and

---

MA, 1972), pp. 45–50. Rosa Zaffuto ("Edizioni e analisi," pp. 60–71 and 115–19) and Justin Brent ("The Legend of Body and Soul in Medieval England," pp. 79–132) have also surveyed them in greater detail in with reference to more recent scholarship. On Old English Soul and Body homilies see also Samantha Zacher, *Preaching the Converted: The Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Book Homilies*, TASS 1 (Toronto, 2009), pp. 140–78.

[61] These are Fadda I (HomM 5); Bazire-Cross IX (HomS 31); and HomS 5, ed. Loredana Teresi, "*Be Heofonwarum 7 be Helwarum*: A Complete Edition," in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser, MRTS 252 (Tempe, AZ, 2002), pp. 226–29. For an overview, see the "Three Utterances Apocryphon" entries by Charles D. Wright in *The Apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Biggs, pp. 80–83.

[62] HomU 12.3 (for which see above, n. 42). See Charles D. Wright, "Seven Heavens Apocryphon," in *The Apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Biggs, pp. 78–79, with references to briefer allusions to the tradition of seven heavens in other anonymous homilies. One of these, HomS 5 (ed. Teresi, "*Be Heofonwarum 7 be Helwarum*") draws on the *Seven Heavens* apocryphon not for the soul's heavenly journey, but for damned soul's swallowing and regurgitation by twelve dragons. See Ananya Jahanara Kabir, "From Twelve Devouring Dragons to the *Develes Ers*: The Medieval History of an Apocryphal Punitive Motif," *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* 238 (2001), 280–98; John Carey, "The Seven Heavens and the Twelve Dragons in Insular Apocalyptic," in *Apocalyptic and Eschatological Heritage: The Middle East and Celtic Realms*, ed. Martin McNamara (Dublin, 2003), pp. 121–36; and Claudia Di Sciacca, "Feeding the Dragon: The Devouring Monster in Anglo-Saxon Eschatological Imagery," *SELIM* 24 (2019), 53–104.

Willard made substantial use of these Irish texts as comparanda.[63] No additional Latin copies have been discovered since then, though additional lists of the names of the heavens have come to light, and one further Irish version unavailable to Willard has been published.[64] Similarly, at the time Willard published his monograph, only one Latin text of the *Three Utterances* sermon had been published, but a vernacular Irish version afforded some additional indirect evidence for lost variant forms of the Latin.[65] Willard subsequently discovered a variant recension of the *Three Utterances* that helped clarify some of the textual problems left unresolved in his monograph.[66] While the evidence for the Latin transmisson of the *Seven Heavens* apocryphon remains almost as exiguous today as it did when Willard's

[63] Seymour, "The Seven Heavens in Irish Literature," *ZfcP*14 (1923), 18–30.

[64] For the Irish versions see now the editions and translations in *The End and Beyond*, ed. John Carey, et al.: John Carey, "The Seven Heavens in *Fís Adomnáin*" (1:197–200); Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, "*Na Seacht Neamha* in the *Liber Flavus Fergusiorum*" (1:201–10); and Emma Nic Cárthaigh, "The Seven Heavens in the Modern Recension of *In Tenga Bithnua*" (1:211–84). For the Old Irish versions of *In Tenga Bithnua* see John Carey, *Apocalyptica*, 1: *In Tenga Bithnua–The Ever-New Tongue*, CCSA 16, Apocrypha Hiberniae 2 (Turnhout, 2009), with the *Seven Heavens* passage at pp. 132–35 (§§26–28) and commentary pp. 277–91. Several lists of the names of the heavens, mainly in Hiberno-Latin compilations, have been identified by J. E. Cross, "Towards the Identification of Old English Literary Ideas–Old Workings and New Seams," in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, Studies in Medieval Culture 20 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1986), pp. 78–79 and 90*;* and by Charles D. Wright and Roger Wright, "Additions to the Bobbio Missal: *De dies malus* and *Joca monachorum* (ff. 6r–8v)," in *The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Rob Meens, Cambridge Studies in Paleography and Codicology 11 (Cambridge, 2004), p. 87, n. 14. See further Carey, "The Seven Heavens: Introduction," in *The End and Beyond*, 1:158–70.

[65] The Old Irish homily has recently been re-edited by Katja Ritari, "The Two Deaths," in *The End and Beyond*, ed. Carey et al., 1:101–11; see also Ritari, "The Irish Eschatological Tale *The Two Deaths* and Its Sources," *Traditio* 68 (2013), 125–51.

[66] Willard, "The Latin Texts of *The Three Utterances of the Soul*," *Speculum* 12 (1937), 147–66.

monograph appeared, the two copies of the *Three Utterances* sermon known to Willard proved to be the tip of an iceberg, with more than fifty manuscript copies having now been identified.[67] One of these proved to be a copy of the immediate source (though not the actual manuscript source) for the variant abbreviated version in Fadda I. The discovery confirmed some of Willard's conjectures about this version of the *Three Utterances* and its source, but also showed that some readings were based on Latin wording that Willard had not been able to anticipate.[68] At the same time, it showed that, far from being a free adaptation, as it had seemed in relation to the Latin texts known to Willard, Fadda I is a very close translation of this variant redaction. More recently, I have identified another copy of this abbreviated Latin *Three Utterances* exemplum embedded within a Latin homily that also preserves further source material for passages immediately preceding and following the exemplum in Fadda I, as well as another Latin text of the *Three Utterances* that is closer to the lost immediate source of Bazire-Cross IX.[69]

The existence of both early English and Irish versions of these apocryphal traditions raised the question of whether the *Three Utterances* or *Seven Heavens* traditions were in any

---

[67] See the handlist in Charles D. Wright, "Latin Analogue for *The Two Deaths: The Three Utterances of the Soul*," in *The End and Beyond*, ed. Carey et al., 1:113–38.

[68] Mary F. Wack and Charles D. Wright, "A New Latin Source for the Old English 'Three Utterances' Exemplum," *ASE* 20 (1991), 187–202. The theological implications of this variant version for early medieval English concepts of the interim state of souls have been discussed by Ananya Jahanara Kabir, *Paradise, Death and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, CSASE 32 (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 167–75.

[69] Charles D. Wright, "More Latin Sources for the Old English 'Three Utterances' Homilies," *MS* 77 (2015), 45–79. I take the opportunity to note that another copy of the *Three Utterances* sermon in the Homiliary of Opatovice (a.k.a of the Archbishop of Prague) that I discussed in relation to Bazire-Cross IX survives in Munich, BSB, clm 6342 (Freising, s. ix$^{3/4}$), fols. 176r–79r, where it closely follows another copy of the rare Pseudo-Isidorian *Sermo* 3 (fols. 158v–62r) that is the main source for HomM 8.

sense distinctively Insular or Irish. On the basis of the materials available to him, Willard concluded that the *Seven Heavens* apocryphon "may have had a great vogue in Ireland, and it may have received Irish colouring, and it may have been preserved chiefly in the Irish world, but it certainly was not of Irish origin" (p. 30).[70] The extent of the Irish role in the transmission of the *Seven Heavens* in the West,[71] and specifically the extent of Irish influence on its Old English manifestations, has been revisited on several occasions,[72] with estimations ranging from half full to half empty, depending on whether the multiple Irish witnesses are played up or down, and whether similarities with the Old English version are weighed more or less heavily than differences.

---

[70] The consensus is that the ultimate sources were Gnostic. See especially Jane Stevenson, "Ascent through the Heavens, from Egypt to Ireland," *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 5 (Summer 1983), 21–35; John Carey, "The Seven Heavens and the Twelve Dragons"; and Charlotte Touati, "The 'Apocalypse of the Seven Heavens': From Egypt to Ireland," in *The End and Beyond*, ed. Carey et al., 1:171–88. For a dissenting view see Richard Bauckham, "The *Apocalypse of the Seven Heavens*: The Latin Version," *Apocrypha* 4 (1993), 141–75; repr. in Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, Novum Testamentum Supplements 93 (Leiden, 1998), pp. 304–31.

[71] The question has been troubled by divergent views of the status of the compilation that transmits the sole surviving Latin text of the apocryphon as either a Priscillianist one or an Irish one (or both). For an overview of the scholarship see Charles D. Wright, "Apocrypha Priscillianistica," in *The Apocrypha*, ed. Biggs, pp. 73–74, as well as John Carey, "The Reichenau Seven Heavens Homily," in *The End and Beyond*, ed. Carey et al., 1:189–96.

[72] Charles D. Wright, *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*, CSASE 6 (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 218–21; Sharon Rowley, "'A wese`n´dan nacodnisse and þa ecan þistru': Language and Mortality in the Homily for Doomsday in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 41," *ES* 86 (2003), 493–510; Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, "Homiletic Texts and the Transmission of Eschatological Apocrypha in a Medieval Irish Context," *Apocrypha* 23 (2012), 150–52; and Nicole Volmering, "The Old English Account of the Seven Heavens," in *The End and Beyond*, ed. Carey et al., 1:285–306.

Willard's views regarding the *Three Utterances* was similar. While recognizing that its ultimate sources would have been early Christian apocrypha (notably the *Visio Pauli*, for which see below, p. 000), he concluded on the basis of its transmission in three Old English and one Irish version that "this theme must have flourished in the British Isles." "Its traits are non-Roman," Willard added, "and one would look to heterodox, rather than to orthodox, theology, and to the Celtic, rather than to the Roman, elements in Old English ecclesiastical life, as the milieu in which it thrived" (*Two Apocrypha*, p. 145). That the *Three Utterances* was a popular tradition in Insular circles (on the Continent as well as in the British Isles) is supported by both its vernacular translations and its early Latin manuscript tradition,[73] and no early-Christian or medieval (non-Insular) origin has been demonstrated, so in my view it very likely is an "Insular" (probably Irish) composition. Yet Willard's characterization of its milieu is problematic. To begin with, his distinction between "Roman" and "Celtic" elements in pre-Conquest England echoed similar impressionistic contrasts by scholars such as Edmund Bishop, M. R. James, and E. A. Lowe, which were commonplace and uncontroversial at the time;[74] yet such essentializing dichotomies are now frowned upon, and the entire subject of the distinctiveness of Irish Christianity and Irish Christian literature is much disputed (see below, pp. 000–000). Again, the term "Celtic" is fraught with questionable assumptions about ethnic identity, cultural cohesion, and institutional or ecclesiastical unity among the various regions of early medieval Europe where Celtic languages were spoken.[75] Finally, the term

[73] See Wright, "Latin Analogue for *The Two Deaths*."

[74] For examples see Wright, *The Irish Tradition*, pp. 3–7.

[75] The notion of a "Celtic Church" has been abandoned. See especially Wendy Davies, "The Myth of the Celtic Church," in *The Early Church in Wales and the West*, ed. Nancy Edwards and Alan Lane, Oxbow Monograph 16 (Oxford, 1992), pp. 12–21. Nonetheless, certain regional commonalities in the ecclesiastical cultures of the multiple "Celtic" churches in the British Isles (and Brittany) do undoubtedly exist. A case for distinctive regional emphases in Christology has been made by Michael W. Herren and Shirley Ann Brown, *Christ in Celtic*

"heterodox" is dubious, since Christian beliefs in the early Middle Ages were not monolithic or completely settled even in such areas as Trinitarian or Eucharistic doctrine. And as J. E. Cross has noted, for many medieval writers "orthodoxy was the record in the manuscripts which they read, whether or not the thought was truly orthodox, or was attached to a respected name."[76] In any case it should not be the scholar's business to endorse any claims to "orthodoxy," whether by the "Roman" church or any other ecclesiastical institution or individual (by Ælfric, for example).[77] Eschatological ideas—especially those about the interim fate of souls between death and the Last Judgement—were especially fluid and open to imaginative literary expression whose aims were more often parenetic than doctrinal. Even if such literary license was more frequently or adventurously resorted to in Ireland than

---

Christianity: Britain and Ireland from the Fifth to the Tenth Century, Studies in Celtic History 20 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2002).

[76] Cross, "Vernacular Sermons in Old English," in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle, Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental 81–83 (Turnhout, 2000), p. 574.

[77] I have criticized characterizations of Irish learned tradition as "heterodox," and equations of the use of apocrypha with heresy, in *The Irish Tradition*, pp. 36–45. Nancy Thompson, "Anglo-Saxon Orthodoxy," in *Old English Literature in Its Manuscript Context*, ed. Joyce Tally Lionarons (Morgantown, WVa, 2004), pp. 37–66, takes issue with contrasts between "orthodox" Benedictine Reform theology as represented by the writings of Ælfric and "heterodox," allegedly pre-Reform materials such as those in the margins of CCCC 41, arguing that such texts are not necessarily pre-Reform and that in any case they remained popular during and after the Reform. In this she agrees with Mary Clayton, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*, CSASE 2 (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 260–65. My own view is that many anonymous homilies probably are originally pre-Reform (and Anglian), but that the Reform had little effect on their popularity. For the dialect evidence see R. D. Fulk, "Anglian Dialect Features in Old English Anonymous Homiletic Literature: A Survey, with Preliminary Findings," in *Studies in the History of the English Language IV: Empirical and Analytical Advances in the Study of English Language Change*, ed. Susan M. Fitzmaurice and Donka Minkova, Topics in English Linguistics 61 (Berlin, 2008), pp. 81–100.

elsewhere (a contentious proposition in itself!),[78] this does not in itself make any resulting texts distinctively Celtic or confessionally heterodox.

In his studies of these Old English eschatological homilies Willard was also able to show that certain traditions relating to the soul's address to the body derived ultimately from the apocryphal *Apocalypse of Paul*, a Long Latin version of which (*Visio Pauli*) had been printed by M. R. James in 1893.[79] Willard was also the first to identify the fragmentary Old English translation of a Long Latin version of the *Visio Pauli* in Oxford, Bodleian Library,

[78] I have in mind the strictures of Patrick Sims-Williams, "The Visionary Celt: The Construction of an Ethnic Preconception," *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* (Summer 1986), 71–96. At the same time, the massive dossier of (mainly vernacular) Irish eschatological writings compiled in the two-volume collection *The End and Beyond*, ed. Carey et al. (note the editors' remarks at 1:1–5) testifies eloquently to the robust visionary impulse in early medieval Ireland. Texts relating to the interim state are surveyed by Charles D. Wright, "The Interim State of Souls in Early Irish Literature," in *The End and Beyond*, 1:301–96. Some of these writings can also be categorised as apocrypha, and a comparably robust appetite for apocryphal literature in early medieval Ireland and England has been thoroughly documented. For Ireland see Martin McNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Early Irish Church* (Dublin, 1983), and McNamara's collected essays, *The Bible and the Apocrypha in the Early Irish Church (A.D. 600–1200)*, Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 66 (Turnhout, 2015), as well as the on-going series *Apocrypha Hiberniae* in CCSA (Turnhout, 2001–). See also David Dumville, "Biblical Apocrypha and the Early Irish: A Preliminary Investigation," *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 73C (1973), 299–338, and John Carey, "The Reception of Apocryphal Texts in Medieval Ireland," in *The Other Side: Apocryphal Perspectives on Early Medieval "Orthodoxies,"* ed. Tobias Nicklas et al., Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus 117 (Tübingen, 2017), pp. 251–69. For early medieval England, see *The Apocrypha*, ed. Biggs, and Hawk, *Preaching Apocrypha*.

[79] James, *Apocrypha Anecdota*, Texts and Studies 2/3 (Cambridge, 1893), pp. 1–42, 189–92; now superseded by *Apocalypse of Paul: A New Critical Edition of the Long Latin Versions*, ed. Theodore Silverstein and Anthony Hilhorst, Cahiers d'Orientalisme 21 (Geneva, 1997).

Junius 85/86.[80] Förster had already noted the use of a shorter Redaction of the *Visio* in Blickling IV and XVI,[81] but Willard went much further in tracing, not just direct textual dependence, but the even more pervasive influence of themes and ideas in both the Long Latin version and the Redactions.[82] Willard's groundbreaking work on the influence of the *Visio* in Old English prose was extended by other scholars. Theodore Silverstein, whose edition of another Long Latin version and eleven short Redactions also appeared in 1935, demonstrated that the description of hell in Blickling XVI was based on the "Hanging Sinners" scene found in several of the short Redactions, a finding that directly affected assessments of the striking parallels between Blickling XVI and the description of Grendel's mere in *Beowulf*.[83] Since then, however, another important early redaction (XI) has been identified, and in 1993 I argued that the passage in Blickling XVI was a conflation of two scenes from the *Visio* (as uniquely attested in Redaction XI) that the Blickling homilist and

[80] Willard, *Two Apocrypha*, p. 66; "The Address of the Soul to the Body," 958. Willard's planned edition never appeared, though excerpts from his transcript were printed by Silverstein, *Visio Sancti Pauli*, p. 95, n. 41; Silverstein refers at several points to Willard's *Two Apocrypha*.

[81] Förster, "Zur vierten Blickling Homily," 149; "Zu den Blickling Homilies," 183–85, 195.

[82] Willard, *Two Apocrypha*, pp. 66–76; "The Address of the Soul to the Body," passim. The formative influence of the *Visio Pauli* on a range of eschatological themes encountered in Old English anonymous homilies is surveyed by Antonette DiPaolo Healey in her 1978 edition of the partial Old English translation of the Long Version, and summarised in her *Sources* Project entry: Healey, *The Old English Vision of Saint Paul*, pp. 41–57, and her two entries "Apocalypse of Paul" in *The Apocrypha*, ed. Biggs, pp. 67–70.

[83] Silverstein, *Visio Sancti Pauli*, pp. 11–12. Silverstein's commentary is still of considerable value, but his texts have been superseded by Lenka Jiroušková, ed., *Die Visio Pauli: Wege und Wandlungen einer orientalischen Apokryphe im lateinischen Mittelalter*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 34 (Leiden, 2006). I use Silverstein's titles for the redactions for the sake of continuity with the Old English scholarship under review here.

the *Beowulf*-poet may have known independently through a lost Old English prose translation of the *Visio*.[84]

Another major discovery relating to the use of apocryphal texts by Old English homilists was Willard's identification of Blickling XIII's narrative of the Assumption of the Virgin as a conflation of two different versions of the *Transitus Mariae*.[85] *Transitus A* and *B* had been published by Tischendorf in 1866, but André Wilmart's publication in 1933 of a new Latin version (dubbed *Transitus C* by Willard) enabled Willard to show that Blickling XIII is a "clumsy union of two conflicting versions of the Assumption …" (p. 7).[86] To his translation of *Transitus C* the homilist had added a second account whose source Willard was

[84] Wright, *The Irish Tradition*, pp. 116–36. See also Tomás O'Sullivan, "The Vision of Saint Paul: Redaction XI," in *The End and Beyond*, ed. Carey et. al., 1:397–415.

[85] Willard, "On Blickling Homily XIII: *The Assumption of the Virgin*. The Source and the Missing Passages," *RES* 12 (1936), 1–17; id., "The Two Accounts of the Assumption in Blickling Homily XIII," *RES* 14 (1938), 1–19. In addition, Willard published a separate textual note on the relation of a brief passage in Blickling XIII to variant readings in *Transitus C* ("La ville d'Agathé? Note sur le Transitus Mariae C," *Échos d'Orient* 38 [1939], 346–54); a study of the vernacular Irish translation of the *Transitus*, which he knew through an English summary by St. John D. Seymour ("The Testament of Mary: The Irish Account of the Death of the Virgin," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 9 [1937], 341–64); and an article on the conclusion to Blickling XIII, a curious conflation of the Magnificat with the Beatitudes ("An Old English 'Magnificat'," *Studies in English* 20 [1940], 5–28).

[86] Comparison with the Latin in tandem with a second copy of the homily in CCCC 198 (LS 20.1) also enabled Willard to verify one suspected lacuna in the Blickling manuscript, while at the same time establishing the manuscript's integrity at another point ("On Blickling Homily XIII"; Willard's conclusions in both cases are accepted by Clayton, *The Apocryphal Gospels*, pp. 239 and 286). For *Transitus C* see Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, Studi e testi 59 (Vatican City, 1933), pp. 325–57. See also Clayton, "The *Transitus Mariae*: The Tradition and Its Origins," *Apocrypha* 10 (1999), 74–98; and Stephen J. Shoemaker, *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford, 2004).

able to approximate by combining material from *Transitus B* with details from *Transitus E*. Willard speculated that the homilist had either worked from both *B* and *E* or had access to a lost version "which was related to both of these latter two, though neither of them as we know them" (p. 8). The second of these hypotheses was validated many years later by the publication of *Transitus B*^{2}, which Mary Clayton has shown is the direct source not only for the second Assumption narrative in Blickling XIII (LS 20) but also for the Assumption homily in CCCC 41 (LS 21).[87] The publication of *B*^{2} showed that Willard's efforts to reconstruct textual variants of the Latin source and of the homily's stages of transmission on the basis of the Old English translation were often wide of the mark. Again, in several cases the homilist's mistranslations were not as egregious as Willard had thought on the basis of the readings of *Transitus B* and *E*. Yet Clayton found that Willard's main conclusions regarding the homilist's conflation of sources and poor Latinity were sound. She also endorsed Willard's judgement that the homilist had deliberately altered a crucial detail in his rendering of *Transitus C* by referring to the translation not of Mary's body (*corpus*) but of her soul (*sawol*), in order to minimize the contradiction between the two accounts (a strategy that generated other contradictions which the homilist failed to resolve).[88] Willard's close attention to the doctrinal implications of this change was a signal departure from the preoccupation of scholars such as Zupitza and Förster with philological and textual matters, and showed that much more might be at stake than a homilist's Latinity. Though Willard did

[87] Clayton, "Blickling Homily XIII Reconsidered," *LSE* n.s. 17 (1986), 25–40; eadem, *The Apocryphal Gospels of Mary*, with a new edition of the homily at pp. 246–72, as well as of the CCCC 41 homily at pp. 216–28. See also Clayton's entries in *Fontes* (1996): "The Sources of Blickling Homily 13 (Cameron B.3.3.20)"; "The Sources of Blickling Homily 13 (supplementary) (Cameron B.3.3.20.1)"; and "The Sources of the Homily on the Assumption of the Virgin (Cameron B.3.3.21)."

[88] Willard, "The Two Accounts," 6–7; Clayton, *The Apocryphal Gospels*, pp. 301–2, nn. 102 and 105.

not label the conflicting views on the Assumption circulating in pre-Conquest England as "ideological," his recognition of the unsettled nature of early medieval "orthodoxy" anticipated contemporary interest in theological disputes as manifestations of cultural conflicts. Still, Willard did not pursue this insight in his comments on the homilist's other alterations or mistranslations, which Clayton has argued were often generated by his eagerness to anticipate the account of Mary's corporal assumption, a doctrine that he, unlike the author of *Transitus C*, enthusiastically endorsed.[89]

Though Willard focused primarily on the influence of apocryphal texts and traditions, he was also among the first to identify (in his 1925 Yale dissertation) the sermons of the sixth-century bishop Caesarius of Arles as sources for Old English homilies, specifically Vercelli VIII and XI. In a 1927 article (his first),[90] Willard showed that Caesarius's dramatic *Ego te, homo* speech of Christ at the Last Judgement (which Caesarius himself may have borrowed from an earlier source) was translated rather closely by the author of Vercelli VIII. Willard posited as an intermediate source a lost homily *In die iudicii* that combined extensive borrowings from Caesarius, including the *Ego te, homo*, with material from other sources, including the first of Gregory's homilies on the Gospels (thus accounting for the homilist's invocation of Gregory rather than Caesarius). Willard was later to note the use of the *Ego te,*

[89] See Clayton, *The Apocryphal Gospels*, p. 145. Kabir, *Paradise, Death and Doomsday*, p. 61, has argued that "many of the homilist's changes were geared towards the redefining of … older eschatological schemes" regarding the interim state and location of souls. See further Jennifer Neville, "Selves, Souls, and Bodies: The Assumption of the Virgin in Anglo-Saxon England," in *Miracles and the Miraculous in Medieval Germanic and Latin Literature*, ed. K. E. Olsen, A. Harbus, and T. Hofstra, Germania Latina 5 (Louvain, 2004), pp. 142–54, who similarly argues that the translator's doctrinal preconceptions "lead him to focus even more strongly on the physical nature of Mary's Assumption than his sources suggested or even allowed" (p. 144).

[90] Willard, "Vercelli Homily VIII and the *Christ*," *PMLA* 42 (1927), 314–30.

homo speech in two other Old English homilies.[91] The analysis of Vercelli VIII was complicated by A. S. Cook's prior discovery that the *Ego te, homo* speech was a source for the Old English poem *Christ III*.[92] Willard's method in comparing two Old English target texts with their common Latin source closely resembles Zupitza's.[93] He notes details found in the two Old English versions that are lacking in Caesarius; details found in *Christ III* and Caesarius but lacking in Vercelli VIII; details unique to Vercelli VIII; and details found in Vercelli VIII and Caesarius but lacking in *Christ III*. From these textual data he concluded that both *Christ III* and Vercelli VIII derive independently from Caesarius, the homily likely (for the reasons already mentioned) through an intermediary, the poem perhaps directly, though the poet must have known the *Ego te, homo* speech in a form very close to Migne's text. Willard's reliance on the text in the PL inevitably limited the precision of his findings, since the antiquated editions Migne reprinted rarely specify variant readings. Germain Morin's edition of the homilies of Caesarius, which first appeared between 1937 and 1942,[94]

---

[91] The homilies cited in manuscript by Willard, "The Address of the Soul to the Body," 980, are Bazire-Cross X (HomS 32) (see Mark Atherton, "The Sources of Bazire and Cross Homily 10 (Cameron B.3.2.32), *Fontes* (1996), Source Details: C.B.3.2.32.006.01) and Nic(D)/Nic(E) (B8.5.3.2 and B8.5.3.3 = HomS 29 in Bately), ed. W. H. Hulme, "The Old English Gospel of Nicodemus," *MP* 1 (1903–04), 612. A fragment with text closely related to Nic(D/E) has been edited by R. I. Page, "An Old English Fragment from Westminster Abbey," *ASE* 25 (1996), 205–7, with diplomatic transcripts of the parallel passages in Nic(D)/Nic(E) at 204–5. Other reflexes of the *Ego te, homo* speech in Old English occur in Bazire-Cross XI (HomS 37) and Assmann XIV (see *VH*, p. 141), and according to Scragg (*VH*, pp. 251–52), it may have also occurred in the missing conclusion to Vercelli XV; cf. Mary Clayton, "Delivering the Damned: A Motif in OE Homiletic Prose," *MÆ* 55 (1986), 94–96.

[92] Cook, *The Christ of Cynewulf* (Boston, 1900), p. 210. See also Frederick M. Biggs, *The Sources of 'Christ III': A Revision of Cook's Notes*, Old English Newsletter Subsidia 12 (1986), pp. 30–33.

[93] For this method, see also the essay by Robert Getz in this volume, p. 000.

[94] *Sancti Caesarii episcopi Arelatensis Opera omnia nunc primum in unum collecta*, ed. Morin, 2 vols. (Bruges, 1937–42); repr. in CCSL 103–4 (Turnhout, 1953). On the reception of Morin's edition and the impetus it

provided not only a base text differing from Migne's, but also an apparatus of selected variant readings. (That this early source study by Willard was written without benefit of Morin's edition was probably also the reason that Willard overlooked the homilist's use of Caesarius's *Sermo* 58 *Castigatio paenitentium*, which was later demonstrated by Joseph B. Trahern.[95]) On the basis of Morin's edition, Edward B. Irving in 1957 was able to reconstruct a composite text of the *Ego te, homo* passage that incorporated variants closer to either *Christ III* or to Vercelli VIII.[96] Yet even Morin's apparatus criticus is highly selective, and further precision may still be possible through research into the unpublished manuscripts of Caesarius's sermons (which would, naturally, begin with those from pre-Conquest England).

By 1949, when Willard published his discovery of the Caesarian source for Vercelli XI,[97] he too had access to Morin's edition and fully exploited it not only for the text but also for information about the homily's transmission. According to Willard (p. 79), Vercelli XI showed "close, though by no means slavish dependence" upon Caesarius's *Sermo* 215 *De natale sancti Felicis*, while the opening sentence derived from Caesarius's *Sermo* 207 (mistakenly cited as "*Sermo* CCIX" by Willard) *De letania*. (The unfortunate term "slavish" was commonly used at the time to characterise closely literal translations, and still is.) Willard included a complete, conservative text of the previously unpublished Vercelli homily with the Caesarian sources in parallel columns, along with more general analogues for parts of the homily not based on Caesarius. Despite its indebtedness to Caesarius, Willard's literary

---

provided to subsequent scholarship see now William E. Klingshirn, "The Wartime and Post-War Reception of Caesarius of Arles," *EME* 26 (2018), 21–34; Klingshirn refers (23) to Willard's study of Vercelli XI.

[95] Trahern, "Caesarius of Arles and Old English Literature," 109–11.

[96] Irving, "Latin Prose Sources for Old English Verse," *JEGP* 56 (1957), 588–95. The PL text, for example, omitted Caesarius's quotation of the *Discedite* passage from Matthew 25:41, which consequently appeared to be an addition by the Old English homilist; but the *Discedite* does occur in Morin's critical text.

[97] Willard, "Vercelli Homily XI and Its Sources," *Speculum* 24 (1949), 76–87.

assessment of the homily was quite favourable: "The whole is wrought into a clear, brief and effective admonition appropriate for Rogation Monday" (p. 80). Willard did not, however, pursue a more detailed analysis of the homilist's "close" dependence on Caesarius, and I have argued that certain tell-tale omissions and modifications suggest that the homilist "tailored" his source by mitigating its condemnation of material wealth to make it more palatable to his audience, perhaps of secular clerics.[98]

In the same year, Willard demonstrated that Blickling IV (HomS 14, also in Junius 86/86) draws extensively upon another sermon by Caesarius (*Sermo* 33 *De reddendis decimis*) on the obligation to tithe.[99] Here too Willard, assisted by Morin's critical edition, paid close attention to the variant forms in which the Caesarian sermon was transmitted, redacted, or excerpted, noting for example (p. 73, n. 46) that a passage missing in certain manuscripts is not translated in the Old English. Willard did not pursue the implications, however, and it was left to Marcia Dalbey to point out that the Old English homilist at that very point substitutes a justification for tithing that is very different from that of Caesarius, fitting a pattern of his

[98] Wright, "Vercelli Homilies XI–XIII and the Benedictine Reform: Tailored Sources and Implied Audiences," in *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages*, ed. Carolyn Muessig, New History of the Sermon 3 (Leiden, 2002), p. 218. This evidence is corroborated by similar source modifications in Vercelli XII and XIII, which are probably by the same author. The homilist's image of "spiritual lamps," drawn from Caesarius, occurs in other anonymous Rogationtide homilies as well and has been the subject of a separate study by Hildegard L. C. Tristram, "Die *leohtfæt*-Metapher in den altenglischen anonymen Bittagspredigten," *NM* 75 (1974), 229–49. Stephen Pelle has recently suggested that the homilist's adaptation of Caesarius's image of spiritual merchants, which is significantly different, in part follows Maximus of Turin's *Sermo* 27: "Sources and Analogues for Blickling Homily V and Vercelli Homily XI," *N&Q* n.s. 59 (2012), 12–13.

[99] Willard, "The Blickling-Junius Tithing Homily and Caesarius of Arles," in *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies*, ed. Thomas A. Kirby and Henry B. Woolf (Baltimore, 1949), pp. 65–78.

mitigation of Caesarius's tone that escaped Willard's notice.[100] Willard did, nonetheless, situate the homily broadly in its social and historical context, noting that, like Caesarius, the Old English homilist regards tithing as a moral but not a legal obligation, and suggesting "that the Old English translation was made either before the tithing legislation of Edgar was enacted, or in total unconcern as to its existence" (p. 71).[101]

Förster had revealed the extent of the use of the homilies of Gregory the Great by Old English anonymous homilists, but it was Willard who first uncovered what proved to be the comparably extensive influence of the homilies of Caesarius.[102] Willard's initial discoveries blazed a trail for later source scholars: between 1932 and 1993 further Caesarian sources were identified for more anonymous homilies by Karl Jost (Assmann XI [HomS 13] and XII [HomS 16]); Neil Ker (Brotanek II [HomS 49]); J. E. Cross (Blickling X and XIV, Vercelli XIII, Bazire-Cross V [HomS 35 = Tristram IV], Bazire-Cross X [HomS 32], Bazire-Cross XI [HomS 37], and Belfour XII [HomU 3 = Irvine VII]); Marcia Dalbey (Blickling III); Paul E. Szarmach (Vercelli XIV and XIX–XXI); R. MacGregor Dawson (Blickling VIII and XI); Joseph Trahern (Vercelli VIII and Assmann XI); Harry Jay Solo (Assmann XIV [HomS 6] and Blickling VIII); and Susan Irvine (Irvine VII).[103] The popularity of Caesarius's homilies

---

[100]Marcia A. Dalbey, "Hortatory Tone in the Blickling Homilies: Two Adaptations of Caesarius," *NM* 70 (1969), 651–57.

[101] On the motif of the tithes of days, see further the contribution by Robert Getz to this volume.

[102] Förster had identified some Caesarian sermons as sources for several homilies by Ælfric, but this was before Morin had restored to Caesarius many Pseudo-Augustinian sermons (as Förster knew them, and Ælfric himself probably regarded them as being by Augustine). By Samantha Zacher's count, Caesarius (a.k.a. "Augustine") provided sources for nine Ælfrician homilies: *Preaching the Converted*, p. 50.

[103] For details (my list of discoveries does not pretend to be exhaustive) see Joseph B. Trahern, Jr., "Caesarius of Arles and Old English Literature: Some Contributions and a Recapitulation," *ASE* 5 (1976), 105–19; Paul E. Szarmach, "Caesarius of Arles and the *Vercelli Homilies*," *Traditio* 26 (1970), 315–23. Trahern does not refer to

was no doubt related to their original purpose as models for parish clergy to instruct the laity by means of simple but vivid and memorable images, as both Willard and Trahern have suggested. It is hardly accidental that three of the most influential passages were dramatic admonitory speeches: Christ's *Ego te, homo* address at Doomsday; "The Dry Bones Speak" exemplum (for which see below, p. 000); and God's rebuke of mankind for failing to tithe.[104]

In assessing the use of Latin sources by vernacular homilists, Willard was more inclined than his predecessors to view discrepancies between the Old English and the Latin as evidence of purposeful adaptation rather than scribal corruption. As a rule he proposed emendations only when the Old English diverged from the Latin in a way that was difficult to construe, and when satisfactory sense could be restored by a palaeographically plausible conjecture supported by comparison with Latin (or by a superior reading in another copy of a

---

Harry Jay Solo, "The Influence of Caesarius of Arles on Two Old English Homilies," *N&Q* n.s. 26 (1978), 196–97, though his contribution is noted by Bately. Caesarius can also be searched as a source author in the *Fontes* database. Trahern's forthcoming *SOEALLC* Project entry on Caesarius (preprint accessible online at http://www.bede.net/saslc/entries.html [accessed 2019 July 18]) now provides the most comprehensive survey. Some cases of the use of Caesarius as a source are complicated by the fact that the Old English homilists used later medieval redactions of his homilies (e.g., Blickling XIV, Brotanek II, and Irvine VII [HomU 3]), or else were translating anonymous sermons in the Pembroke Homiliary that quoted Caesarius extensively (e.g., Vercelli XIX and XXI, Assmann XI; Assmann XII adds passages from Caesarius independently). In a few cases (e.g., Blickling XIV again) a particular passage based on Caesarius had been borrowed by Caesarius himself from another source (as perhaps in the case of the *Ego te, homo* speech).

[104] The author of Blickling IV (HomS 14) (ed. Willard, "The Blickling-Junius Tithing Homily," p. 76), however, converts this speech from Caesarius's *Sermo* 33 into an address in the voice of the preacher. Moreover, Willard was incorrect in claiming (p. 68) that this was also the source of God's rebuke of mankind in Ælfric (*CH* II, VII) and Napier XLIX (HomS 40.1 = Vercelli X = Blickling IX); in "Old English Homilies and Latin Sources," p. 49, I failed to correct Willard's misidentification in citing this alleged use of Caesarius. The direct source for these two Old English homilies is in fact the anonymous *Sermo de misericordia*, for which see below, p. 000.

given homily).[105] His characterization of the homilists' treatment of their sources contrasts with Förster's verdict that most of translations in the Blickling Homilies were "fast wörtlich": "In fact," Willard argued, "we find that the redactors and translators took liberties with their sources, here following closely, there translating freely, now condensing and omitting, and again, expanding and introducing new material."[106] To Förster, the first to read many of these homilies alongside their sources, the liberties must have seemed trivial in comparison to the long stretches of almost verbatim translation (which he usually characterized neutrally as "fast wörtlich," though in the case of the Blickling Homilies as a whole more negatively as "fast ängstlich," even "oft sklavisch" in the case of Blickling XIV). Yet to Willard,for whom the homilies' often close dependence upon Latin sources was a given rather than a revelation, such liberties as the homilists took were cumulatively more impressive and interesting. Willard shared with Förster, however, the conviction that Latin sources were keys to the meaning of the Old English (whether in terms of congruence or divergence), and neither scholar, perhaps, would have appreciated the potential value of considering the reception of Old English homilies by audiences who did not share the English preacher's (or the modern scholars') access to those sources. But the shift of critical attention in literary studies from authorial production and intention to textual autonomy and reception was still many years away. (It is important to bear in mind, however, that a vernacular homilist's response to his sources is itself an instance of reception.)

---

[105] In editing Old English homilies, Willard followed Förster's practice of printing the texts as in the manuscript and relegating suggested emendations to footnotes.

[106] Willard, "Vercelli VIII," 319. Cf. Willard's assessment of Blicking IV: "The Old English translator has handled his materials freely, usually giving meaning for meaning, after Jerome's phrase, rather than word for word, generously adding such materials as he finds appropriate to his needs and manner" ("The Blickling-Junius Tithing Homily," p. 67).

Willard's 1949 essays on Vercelli XI and Blickling IV were to be his last published source discoveries, though as late as 1960 he edited a facsimile edition of the Blickling Homilies,[107] and up to the mid-1950s his students at the University of Texas at Austin prepared separate editions of several Vercelli homilies as well as homilies in CCCC 41 as Master's theses or PhD dissertations.[108] Unfortunately, Willard's projected complete edition of the anonymous homilies in Junius 85/86 never materialized.[109]

L2 J. E. Cross

The most influential post-war source scholar, whose discoveries surpassed Förster's and Willard's both in number[110] and ultimately in significance and methodological implications,

[107] *The Blickling Homilies: The John H. Scheide Library Titusville, Pennsylvania*, ed. Willard, EEMF 10 (Copenhagen, 1960). A feature article by Jean Holloway, "History in the Homilies," *Alcalde: The University of Texas Alumni Magazine* (June 1962), 7–9, includes a photograph of Willard with the facsimile.

[108] Orline Clinksales, "Text, Translation, and Glossary, of Vercelli Homily XIX" (MA thesis, 1938); Harry C. Snider, "The Old English Homily 'Dominica tertia in quadragesima' in ms. Junius 86" (MA thesis, 1940); William M. Ryan, "Four Unpublished Old English Homilies" (PhD diss., 1955); J. L. Dillard, "*De Parasceve*, An Old English Vernacular Passion" (PhD diss., 1956). In addition, two of Willard's students produced glossaries to major collections of anonymous homilies: Robert Sven Stilwell, "A Glossary for the Vercelli Prose Homilies" (PhD diss., 1947); Laurita Lyttleton Hill, "A Glossary of the Marginal Homilies of MS 41, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge" (PhD diss., 1947).

[109] The previously unpublished homilies from this manuscript have since been edited by A. M. Luiselli Fadda, Homily I, pp. 1–31 (= HomM 5); Homily VIII, pp. 167–73 (= HomM 14). See also John Nicholas Chadbon, "Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Junius 85/86: An Edition of a Witness to the Old English Homiletic Tradition" (PhD diss., University of Leeds, 1993).

[110] The Author Index to Bately, *Anonymous Old English Homilies*, p. 72, lists 37 entries under his name. Cross also sourced parts of Blickling XIV (LS 12) (see below, p. 000).

was J. E. Cross (1920–1996), who taught at the universities of Bristol and Liverpool.[111] Aside from the sheer volume of his source discoveries, Cross went beyond both Förster and Willard in teasing out their implications for vernacular homilists' methods of composition (including the crucial role of memory), and also in pursuing the literary and theological significance of homilists' modifications of their sources.

Cross's early work focused on the transmission of Christian-Latin themes in Old English poetry and prose. Although he ventured typological or allegorical readings of poems such as *Exodus* and *The Phoenix*,[112] Cross was not a "Robertsonian," as he made clear in his review of *Doctrine and Poetry* by B. F. Huppé (the Robertsonian standard-bearer in the field of Old English literature).[113] Instead of reading Old English literature as uniformly

---

[111] For biographical sketches see "J. E. Cross: A Biographical Note," in *Sources and Relations: Studies in Honour of J. E. Cross*, ed. Marie Collins, Jocelyn Price, and Andrew Hamer, *LSE* n.s. 16 (1985), 3–6, and the obituary by Thomas D. Hill, Charles D. Wright, and Susan E. Deskis in *Speculum* 73 (1998), 958–55. For bibliographies of his published scholarship, see "Bibliography of the Writings of J. E. Cross," in *Sources and Relations*, ed. Collins et al., pp. 358–62; Thomas N. Hall, "A Bibliography of the Writings of J. E. Cross 1985–2000," in *Via Crucis: Studies in Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross*, ed. Thomas N. Hall, with Thomas D. Hill and Charles D. Wright, Medieval European Studies 1 (Morgantown, WVa, 2002), pp. 433–38. Cross's papers are in the Archive of Liverpool University, D736 (finding list online at http://sca-arch.liv.ac.uk/ead/search?operation=full&recid=gb141unistaffc-d-d736. Accessed 2019 July 10).

[112] J. E. Cross and S. I. Tucker, "Allegorical Tradition and the OE *Exodus*," *Neophilologus* 44 (1960), 122–27; Cross, "The Conception of the Old English Phoenix," in *Old English Poetry: Fifteen Essays*, ed. Robert P. Creed (Providence, RI, 1967), pp. 129–52.

[113] Cross, review of Huppé, *Doctrine and Poetry: Augustine's Influence on Old English Poetry* (Albany, NY, 1959), in *JEGP* 59 (1960), 561–64. At that time, the allegorical and Augustinian approach to medieval literature of D. W. Robertson, as well as of his sometime collaborator Huppé, was generating heated controversy, which became even hotter following the publication of Robertson's *A Preface to Chaucer* (Princeton, 1962). Scholars such as Cross and R. E. Kaske, who focused on the Christian-Latin backgrounds of Old and Middle English

Augustinian and allegorical, Cross sought to explicate allusions to Christian motifs that, while learned, were generally commonplace, and as often literal as figural.[114]

A 1956 study of the *ubi sunt* theme showed that Isidore of Seville's *Synonyma* was the direct source for passages in several Old English homilies and the ultimate source for some others.[115] Finding that the homilists often followed their Latin models closely (occasionally even quoting them in Latin), Cross warned of "the danger of detailed comment on originality in Old English homiletic prose until sources have been clearly identified and Latin scholars have collated and edited manuscripts of the patristic sermons showing all variant readings" (p. 29). The caveat does not imply that the discovery of close Latin sources vitiates all claims of originality, but asserts that the degree and kind of originality can be evaluated only by comparison with known sources, and also reminds us that surviving manuscripts or published editions of Latin texts do not always represent exactly what a homilist had in front of him. Cross was, nonetheless, convinced that in some cases "the writer adds to and varies the 'ubi sunt' phrases in his Latin original,"[116] and in other publications he attempted to determine by

---

religious imagery, but who did not share Robertson's reductive view that virtually all medieval literature that was not overtly "conducive to charity" must be allegorical, have tended to be lumped together with Robertson and Huppé as "exegetical critics."

[114] In the interpretation of Old English poetry this scholarly tradition goes back to the work of A. S. Cook on the three *Christ* poems (*The Christ of Cynewulf* [Boston, 1900]), and Friedrich Klaeber on the "Christian elements" in *Beowulf* ("Die christlichen Elemente im *Beowulf*," *Anglia* 35 [1911], 111–36, 249–70, 453–82; 36 [1912], 169–99; trans. Paul Battles, *The Christian Elements in* Beowulf, Old English Newsletter Subsidia 24 [Kalamazoo, MI, 2000]).

[115] Cross, "'Ubi sunt' Passages in Old English." For detailed surveys of the topos with updated references to source scholarship since Cross's essay, see Zaffuto, "Edizioni e analisi," pp. 72–97, and Claudia Di Sciacca, *Finding the Right Words: Isidore's 'Synonyma' in Anglo-Saxon England*, Toronto Old English Series 19 (Toronto, 2008), pp. 109–38.

[116] Cross, "'The Dry Bones Speak': A Theme in Some Old English Homilies," *JEGP* 56 (1957), 436.

comparison with Latin sources to what extent and in what ways vernacular homilists were original with their originals.[117] When we have only an approximation of a homilist's sources, such assessments do inevitably run the risk of overstating the degree of originality,[118] or of misrepresenting the ways a homilist adapted those sources and hence of misunderstanding his responses to them and how he was attempting to mediate them for his audience.[119] Yet for source scholars (and for critics who rely on their findings) the answer is not to refrain from venturing interpretations until such time as closer variant texts of those sources have been uncovered—which in some cases may not ever happen. The task, as I see it, should be to "save the appearances" in each case as best we can with the sources we have to work with, recognizing that if better data emerges these assessments may be subject to small- or large-scale correction (as in the case of Cross's assessment of Fadda I and a Pseudo-Augustinian Doomsday sermon, on which see below, p. 000).[120]

In a 1956 article on "The Dry Bones Speak" exemplum, Cross examined three Old

---

[117] I use the much-maligned term "original" for "source" partly because Förster, Willard, and Cross did so, and partly for the sake of the pun, which conveys that a target text can be "original" in manifold ways, and not merely derivative. At the same time, modern scholars privilege "originality" as a literary and intellectual value in a way that would almost certainly be baffling to the early English homilists, and that often results in negative evaluations of the anonymous ones in comparison to Ælfric and Wulfstan.

[118] One hedge against disappointment is to shift the standard of value from originality to rhetorical "effectiveness," a strategy that enabled Marcia Dalbey, in an essay on Blickling VII, to sidestep the problem of "what [a homilist's] sources are and how intentional are his deviations from those sources" ("Patterns of Preaching in the Blickling Easter Homily," *ABR* 24 [1973], 479–80, n. 4).

[119] On this problem, see also Stephen Pelle's reassessment of Dorothy Haines's edition of a Sunday Letter homily in this volume, p. 000.

[120] As Cross somewhat ruefully noted, "source-analysis is a progressive activity, and a newly-found source necessitates insertion and correction" (*Cambridge Pembroke College MS 25: A Carolingian Sermonary used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, KCLMS 1 (London, 1987), p. vii).

English homilies' relation to their source in Caesarius's *Sermo* 31 *De elemosinis* (and a variant version in a later Pseudo-Augustinian *Sermo* 66 *Ad fratres in eremo*) without preconceptions as to the homilists' relative degree of originality. Comparison with the Latin source showed that the author of Vercelli XIII sometimes echoed selected phrases and sometimes translated closely for substantial stretches, taking over with little alteration the speech of the dry bones, whereas a homily in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (Belfour XII [HomU3 = Irvine VII]) used selected sentences from Caesarius within "a patchwork of borrowings" (p. 436) from other sources, to which the homilist added material apparently of his own composition.[121] Cross noted, however, that "[b]oth the Old English homilies independently insert 'if the bones speak' and the Bodley sermon feels it necessary to conclude with 'Then dear men, though the dead bones cannot speak from the tomb yet we can teach ourselves by this'" (p. 437). Acknowledging the possibility that such an adaptation might be due to a Latin intermediary, Cross nonetheless speculated that the Old English homilists added this phrase to clarify Caesarius's literary image for a less sophisticated audience. Indeed, the addition is reminiscent of one made to Caesarius's *Ego te, homo* speech by the authors of Vercelli VIII and *Christ III*, both of whom (as Willard pointed out) felt it necessary to explain that when Christ addresses a single "man" (*homo*) he is really speaking to all.[122] Such changes can, therefore, afford insight into the nature of homilists' intended or implied audiences. An audience more at home with literary conventions seems to be implied in Blickling X, whose author, Cross argued, was responsible for a "radical" and "distinctive" (pp. 438 and 439) adaptation of Caesarius's exemplum. In this version the dead man is mourned by a loving relative whose grief causes him to go into exile for many years, an

[121] See also Susan Irvine, "The Sources of Irvine Homily 7 (Cameron B.3.4.3)," *Fontes* (1997), and her discussion of the theme in the commentary to her edition (see Irvine, pp. 183–87).

[122] Willard, "Vercelli Homily VIII," 327.

elaboration inspired, perhaps, by the exile theme of Old English poetry;[123] and instead of being accused and admonished by the dry bones, he is exhorted to contemplate his own heart and to merit that his prayers—including his petition for the release of his relative's soul from punishment—will be accepted by God. As Cross emphasises, "[s]uch an alternative possibility of redemption has no place in Caesarius's admonition and the Blickling homilist blunts the warning by allowing a happy ending for the friend's virtue" (p. 438).

Motifs and exempla such as the *ubi sunt* and "The Dry Bones Speak" that were adapted independently by more than one vernacular homilist thus enabled Cross to distinguish translational strategies, didactic purposes, and doctrinal emphases of different homilists. The use of a common Latin source did not in itself determine a common approach or meaning, but provided the raw material from which homilists crafted addresses that suited their own purposes and intended audiences. Some were content to translate closely, with relatively minor additions and omissions, while others, such as the author of Blickling X (one of the most self-consciously "literary" vernacular homilists) took inspiration from the source but adapted it with such freedom that only the "basic similarity of pattern" (p. 438) and scattered "echoes of phrases and ideas" (p. 439) remain to betray the relation. Cross's subsequent discovery that Blickling X and Ælfric's homily on the Theban Legion (ÆLS Maurice) adapt the same passage from Gregory's *Homilia* 29 *in Evangelia* on the theme of the world's youth and age[124] showed, again, how two Old English writers might use the same source for different purposes, and therefore adapt it in different ways: Ælfric focused specifically on Gregory's invocation of martyrs Nereus and Achilleus, because they had been Roman imperial soldiers whose "situation was similar to that of the Theban legion … massacred

[123] As suggested by Irvine, p. 184, n. 1.

[124] Cross, "Gregory, 'Blickling Homily X' and Ælfric's 'Passio S. Mauricii' on the World's Youth and Age," *NM* 66 (1965), 327–30.

because they would not practise idolatry … ," whereas the Blickling homilist, who does not even mention their names, instead applied Gregory's description of their times "to the beginning of the world since he recognised in it the features of the Golden Age" (p. 329).

In a later study of Blickling XIV (LS 12),[125] Cross exemplified in detail his view that "analysis of the handling and the placing of acceptable sources identifies a homilist's method which can then be applied to confirm additional sources" (p. 146). In 1909 Förster had identified an abbreviated recension of a sermon by Petrus Chrysologus (Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 199) as a major source for the homily, and suggested that several additions were based on certain other Augustinian and Pseudo-Augustinian sermons.[126] Cross's study affords an instructive comparison, for it builds on Förster's work but also advances considerably beyond it in precision of identification, refinement of method, and widening of scope. Cross confirms the use of Chrysologus (via Pseudo-Augustine) and Augustine (*Sermo* 287 and *Sermo* 288), but questions the parallels with Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 198 because they show only general similarity of idea without distinctive verbal echo, and because the Blickling homilist uses different supporting scriptural quotations. He then observes that all the "acceptable" sources proposed by Förster were included in the homiliary of Alanus of Farfa,[127] which thus becomes a plausible candidate for the homilist's insitutional homiliary. This leads to consideration of

---

[125] Cross, "Blickling Homily XIV and the Old English Martyrology on John the Baptist," *Anglia* 93 (1975), 145–60. Mark Atherton's entry "The Sources of Blickling Homily 14 (Cameron B.3.3.12)," *Fontes* (1996), lacks Cross's findings. See also Thomas N. Hall, "The Armaments of John the Baptist in Blickling Homily 14 and the Exeter Book *Descent into Hell*," in *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Virginia Blanton and Helene Scheck, MRTS 334 (Tempe, AZ, 2008), pp. 289–306.

[126] Förster, "Altenglische Predigtquellen. II.," 246–56. See Thomas N. Hall's forthcoming *SOEALLC* Project entry "Chrysologus, Peter."

[127] For an analysis of this homiliary see Réginald Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux: Analyse de manuscrits*, Biblioteca degli "Studi Medievali" 12 (Spoleto, 1980), pp. 127–221.

two other sermons on John found in Alanus's homiliary, Pseudo-Ambrose *Sermo* 51 and Caesarius's *Sermo* 216 *In natale sancti Iohannis Baptistae*, which provide sources for several other passages (though which of these the homilist actually consulted is complicated by the fact that Caesarius himself draws verbatim on Pseudo-Ambrose). Finally, in comparing passages from the Latin sources with the Old English, Cross isolates changes, omissions, and additions in order to assess their rationale, whether rhetorical or doctrinal, and thereby to understand something of the homilist's "method," his way of working with sources and combining them with other sources, including scriptural testimonies. The difference between Cross's assumptions and those of Förster regarding the relation between Latin sources and Old English target texts (to use the current terminology) is manifested in a subtle but significant difference in practice: whereas Förster used the equals sign (=) to link parallel Latin and Old English passages, Cross used "Cf."

Cross's emphasis on the role of memory was among his most important contributions to our understanding of Old English preachers' methods of composition. His evidence for memorial composition was drawn primarily from Ælfric,[128] whose extensive surviving writings enabled comparisons of his citations of biblical and patristic texts in multiple passages, exemplifying Ælfric's memorial associations of related biblical testimonies and of commentary on them. Analysis of Ælfric's "processes of association," Cross believed, "can allow us to see the mind of one Anglo-Saxon religious revealed in his works … ."[129] While

[128] See especially Cross, "Ælfric – Mainly on Memory and Creative Method in Two Catholic Homilies," *Studia Neophilologica* 41 (1969), 135–55, and "More Sources for Two of Ælfric's Catholic Homilies," *Anglia* 86 (1968), 59–78. Cross's work on the sources of Ælfric's homilies and saints' lives through 1982 is indexed and summarised by Luke Reinsma, *Ælfric: An Annotated Bibliography*, Garland Reference Library of the Humanities 617 (New York, 1987).

[129] Cross, "Mainly on Memory," 136.

conceding that we "cannot look over Ælfric's shoulder as he composed"[130] and can see only "the writer's *revealed mind*," Cross argued that we can "speculate with confidence" about Ælfric's "power of recall" on the basis of his combinations of multiple biblical and patristic sources, and that his habits of composition would emerge from observing the recurring patterns of association.[131] Such patterns would aid in the identification of further sources by making it possible to anticipate how extensions on the main source might have been generated from memory of related biblical verses, commentary, or commonplaces. Cross also believed that exemplification of Ælfric's memorial composition would yield "a more certain standard for speculation on the processes of association in other religious works, both from poets and homilists."[132] The principle that "association of commentary and Scriptural verse is a pattern for finding sources," for example, led to a discovery of an additional source for the exposition of Luke 2:1–14 in Vercelli V.[133] By consulting patristic homilies on this pericope Förster had already found one source in Gregory's *Homilia* 8 *in Evangelia*; but by consulting the scriptural index in the PL edition of Gregory's homilies, Cross found that Gregory also commented upon the same Lucan passage in his fifth Gospel homily, which proved to be another source for the exposition in Vercelli V.[134]

Cross never attempted a systematic analysis of memory in Old English anonymous homilies as he had done for several by Ælfric, in part because there are few cases of single authorship of multiple homilies, making it harder to establish patterns of association or habits of composition. He did, however, speculate on memorial composition in a number of

---

[130] James E. Cross, "The Literate Anglo-Saxon – On Sources and Disseminations," *PBA* 58 (1972), 92.

[131] Cross, "Mainly on Memory," 136, n. 3 and 135.

[132] Cross, "Mainly on Memory," 136.

[133] Cross, "The Literate Anglo-Saxon," 93.

[134] See also Mark Atherton, "The Sources of Vercelli Homily 5 (Cameron B.3.2.1)," *Fontes* (1996).

individual homilies, notably among the Rogationtide homilies he edited in collaboration with Joyce Bazire,[135] focusing on biblical verses that had been memorised and ruminated upon, as well as on commonplaces that were independent of specific sources. Bazire-Cross XI (HomS 37), for example, incorporates many "loose" citations of Scripture, grouped thematically and blended with one another and with reminiscences of Doomsday commonplaces deriving ultimately from sources such as Caesarius and the *Apocalypse of Thomas*. On the basis of the preacher's handling of such material, Cross concluded that the homily "appears to be written freely without reference to a book," drawing instead upon recall of biblical and patristic commonplaces as mediated by other vernacular homilies.[136]

One of Cross's most explicit discussions of method in source scholarship came in his British Academy Gollancz Lecture of 1972, "The Literate Anglo-Saxon – On Sources and Disseminations," from which I have already quoted several observations relating to memorial association. Here Cross further distinguished between a "source" (whether immediate, intermediary, or ultimate) and a "dissemination," the latter term designating not a particular text but "a certain sequence of words which is recorded in a number of Latin texts."[137] The reason for the distinction is that an idea or commonplace might often be expressed in a sequence of Latin words that circulated widely in quotations and extracts; such a sequence may not be traceable to a particular source, but even if it is, it may be impossible to determine whether an Old English writer knew that source, or found the sequence in some surviving or lost intermediary. In either case, however, Cross stressed that "verbal equivalence obviously indicates that a particular Latin reading was available."[138] This begs the question, of course, as to what constitutes "verbal equivalence" across languages; but instead of defining the relation

[135] See Bazire-Cross. In addition to the example cited here, compare similar comments about homily X (p. 126).

[136] Bazire-Cross, pp. 136 and 138.

[137] Cross, "The Literate Anglo-Saxon," 68.

[138] Ibid., 69.

theoretically, Cross was content to assume that consensus would validate (or reject) specific source claims. By the same token, "differences" can most confidently be defined within a context of verbal similarity: the wording of an Old English text that recognizably corresponds to that of a Latin source or "dissemination" enables substantive differences to be isolated. One may then speculate about the reasons for them, which Cross concedes "can, at best, only be probabilities."[139] The examples he discusses exemplify various potential causes of difference: scribal error in the transmission of the Old English; variant readings in the transmission of the Latin; memorial citation, which may involve blending of multiple sources or disseminations, often calling forth scriptural testimonies associated with a given topic; and deliberate modifications prompted by rhetorical or doctrinal concerns, or by the "intellectual environment"[140] that conditioned an English writer's understanding of a Latin sequence of words and his formulation of a translation in his native language.[141]

In the 1970s Cross began to focus on a new avenue of research on the sources of Old English prose: Hiberno-Latin texts and "Insular" traditions. The prospect of Irish influences (whether in the form of Irish texts or Irish intermediaries or adaptations of non-Irish texts) had already been broached in connection with the *Seven Heavens* and *Three Utterances* by Willard (see p. 000 above), who also had identified close parallels for Vercelli V in the florilegium edited partially by André Wilmart in 1933 under the title *Catéchèses Celtiques*

[139] Loc. cit.

[140] Cross, "The Literate Anglo-Saxon," 71 and 83.

[141] If difference is potentially revealing of an author's (mis)understanding or intentions, equivalence is valuable on a more basic level as evidence for the meanings of Old English words. When a word of unknown or doubtful meaning appears to correspond to a particular Latin word in a larger context of "verbal equivalence," it is likely that it overlapped semantically. Cross therefore frequently stressed the significance of source discoveries to lexicographers and editors (e.g., "The Literate Anglo-Saxon," 68–69).

(now generally called the *Catechesis Celtica*).[142] Bernhard Bischoff's identification in 1954 of some forty Hiberno-Latin or Irish-influenced biblical commentaries added a vast new corpus of potential source material, but by the mid-1970s only a few of these commentaries had been edited, mainly by Bischoff's student R. E. McNally and McNally's student Joseph Kelly.[143] Their thematic studies of "Hiberno-Latin" exegesis followed up Bischoff's theory of "Irish symptoms," that is, motifs and stylistic features deemed characteristic of (though not necessarily exclusive to) Hiberno-Latin and Irish-influenced commentaries. By the mid-1980s Cross had acquired microfilms of some of these commentaries, as well as typescripts of McNally's unpublished editions of the Hiberno-Latin compilations *Liber de Numeris*, *Catechesis Celtica*, and *Catechesis Cracoviensis*. In "Towards the Identification of Old English Literary Ideas – Old Workings and New Seams," his paper for the inaugural symposium on the "Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture" at Kalamazoo in 1983,[144] Cross called on Old English scholars "to read and absorb those works which scholars have distinguished as

---

[142] For details see Atherton, "The Sources of Vercelli Homily 5." Willard's work on the sources of the portents has been importantly revised and complicated by both Cross, "Portents and Events at Christ's Birth: Comments on Vercelli V and VI and the Old English Martyrology," *ASE* 2 (1973), 209–20, and Thomas N. Hall, "The Portents at Christ's Birth in *Vercelli Homilies* V and VI: Some Analogues from Medieval Sermons and Biblical Commentaries," in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Zacher and Orchard, pp. 62–97; see further the articles by Matthias Tveitane and James W. Marchand cited by Hall, p. 68, n. 14.

[143] Bischoff, "Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter," in Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart, 1966–81), 1:205–73. For further references see Charles D. Wright, "Hiberno-Latin Literature," Oxford Bibliographies, online at at http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195396584/obo-9780195396584-0249.xml. Accessed 2019 July 10.

[144] Cross's essay was published in the proceedings volume, *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Kalamazoo, MI, 1986), pp. 77–102.

having 'Irish symptoms'."[145] By way of illustration, he drew attention to Hiberno-Latin parallels for "five distinctive ideas"[146] in *The Prose Solomon and Saturn* and *Adrian and Ritheus*, Vercelli XIX, and the *Old English Martyrology*. These ideas mainly involved literal extensions of the biblical narrative: specifying, for example, that Eve was created from a rib drawn from Adam's left side, or that the tree of knowledge was a fig. Stressing the value of the massive commentary on the entire Bible known as *The Reference Bible* as a compendium of information that in some cases "is known elsewhere only in lands far distant from Anglo-Saxon England,"[147] Cross printed an extract concerning Cain that affords parallels with the *Beowulf*-poet's description of Cain's monstrous descendants.[148]

Not surprisingly, Cross was the first scholar to heed his own call to read Hiberno-Latin texts. He had already noted the use of Adomnán's *De locis sanctis* (independently of Bede) in Blickling XI[149] and of the *Liber de ordine creaturarum* in Belfour XI (HomU 2 = Irvine

[145] Cross, "Towards the Identification," p. 79.

[146] Ibid., p. 80.

[147] Ibid., p. 81.

[148] Ibid., pp. 92–100. The part of this commentary on the Pentateuch has since been edited by Gerard MacGinty, *Pauca problesmata de enigmatibus ex tomis canonicis: Praefatio et libri de Pentateucho Moysi*, CCCM 173 (Turnhout, 2000). On the significance of the commentary for representations of the "kin of Cain" in *Beowulf* see also Andy Orchard, *Pride and Prodigies: Studies in the Monsters of the Beowulf-Manuscript* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 72–76. Cross also drew attention to parallels in Irish sources (and in the Canterbury glosses attributed to Theodore and Hadrian) for the idea found *The Prose Solomon and Saturn* (and illustrated in some early English manuscripts) that Cain slew Abel with the jawbone of an ass (or camel): Cross and Thomas D. Hill, *The Prose Solomon and Saturn and Adrian and Ritheus*, McMaster Old English Studies and Texts 1 (Toronto, 1982), pp. 101–2; Cross, "Cain's Jawbone: Earlier Allusions" in *KM 80: A Birthday Album for Kenneth Muir, Tuesday, 5 May, 1987*, ed. A. Kettle (Liverpool, 1987), pp. 32–33.

[149] Cross, "On the Blickling Homily for Ascension Day (No. XI)," *NM* 70 (1969), 228–40.

VI)[150]; and he had followed up Willard's discovery of the use of the *Catechesis Celtica* (or a closely related compilation) in Vercelli V and VI.[151] He was also able to cite Hiberno-Latin parallels for a number of entries in the *Old English Martyrology*,[152] and to note the transmission of Hiberno-Latin commentaries in early English manuscripts.[153] This research—the results of which he summarised himself in 1999[154]—culminated with his 1987 description of the "insular connections" of the "Pembroke Homiliary," a major resource for vernacular preachers (on its significance for Old English anonymous homilies see below, pp. 000–000).[155] By this time Cross preferred the term "insular" to "Irish" or "Hiberno-Latin," partly

[150] Cross, "*De Ordine Creaturarum Liber* in Old English Prose," *Anglia* 90 (1972), 132–40. See also Irvine, "The Sources of Irvine Homily 6 (Cameron B.3.4.2)," *Fontes* (1997). In her edition (Irvine, pp. 152–53), she notes several details independent of Pseudo-Isidore common to both Irvine VI and the *Old English Martyology*, suggesting their mutual dependence on a lost intermediary. See also Christine Rauer, "Usage of the Old English Martyrology," in *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, Mediaevalia Groningana n.s. 9, ed. Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr., and Kees Dekker (Leuven, 2007), p. 135.

[151] See n. 142 above. See now also Thijs Porck's discovery of Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* as a source for Irvine VII as reported in his essay in this volume.

[152] Cross, "The Influence of Irish Texts and Traditions on the Old English Martyrology," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 81C (1981), 173–92. See also the commentary by Christine Rauer, ed., *The Old English Martyrology: Edition, Translation and Commentary* (Cambridge, 2013), passim. For individual sections one can also consult Rauer's entries in *Fontes* (for a complete list search "ANON [OE Martyrology]").

[153] Cross, "Hiberno-Latin Commentaries in Salisbury Manuscripts before 1125 A.D.," *Hiberno-Latin Newsletter* 3 (1989), 8–9 (drawing in part on the work of Teresa Webber).

[154] Cross, "On Hiberno-Latin Texts and Anglo-Saxon Writings," in *The Scriptures and Early Medieval Ireland*, ed. Thomas O'Loughlin, Instrumenta Patristica 31 (Turnhout, 1999), pp. 69–79.

[155] Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS 25*; see pp. 18 and 64–87 for his discussion of "insular connections," as well as Cross, "On Hiberno-Latin Texts," pp. 70–75. I have noted vernacular Irish parallels for one motif that Cross speculated was an example of "medieval Irish rationalisation" but was not able to locate

because the commentaries Bischoff identified were not necessarily all compiled by Irish authors, but also because the parallels in Old English texts (unknown to Bischoff) indicated a broader dissemination of "Irish symptoms" in the British Isles. Since then, a number of additional texts of the Hiberno-Latin or Insular persuasion have been critically edited and have been cited by scholars of Old English (and early Middle English) homilies,[156] while Bischoff's conception and canon of "Irish" exegesis has been both attacked and defended.[157]

---

elsewhere: Wright, "Why the Left Hand is Longer (or Shorter) than the Right: Some Irish Analogues for An Etiological Legend in the Homiliary of St. Père de Chartres," in *Intertexts*, ed. Blanton and Scheck, pp. 161–68.

[156] For a survey of relevant texts and scholarship through the late 1980s see Charles D. Wright, "Hiberno-Latin and Irish-Influenced Biblical Commentaries, Florilegia, and Homily Collections," in *SASLC*: *A Trial Version*, pp. 87–123. In *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature* I have cited extensive parallels in Irish (both Hiberno-Latin and vernacular) texts, especially for Vercelli IX but also for a number of other Old English anonymous homilies (see the Index, pp. 317–18). More recent work has extended these source discoveries for certain homilies. For example, in 1988 I had cited close parallels for several passages in the first half of Blickling III from both published and unpublished Hiberno-Latin commentaries (Wright, "Blickling Homily III on the Temptations in the Desert," *Anglia* 106 [1988], 130–37). In 2010, Robert Getz, aided by Jean Rittmueller's critical edition of one of these, the *Liber questionum in euangeliis* [*LQE*], CCSL 108F (Turnhout, 2003), was able to identify further parallels and to show that many also occur in an unpublished, allegedly Hiberno-Latin commentary by a certain "Frigulus" (on whom see the following note) that was a major source for *LQE*. Getz concludes that the homilist drew upon a Hiberno-Latin compilation that underlies both Frigulus and *LQE*, and that is also witnessed by excerpts in Smaragdus, *Expositio libri comitis*, and in a homily in a twelfth-century Worcester manuscript. See Getz, "More on the Sources of Blickling Homily III," *N&Q* n.s. 57 (2010), 281–90.

[157] Controversy has centered especially on the Hiberno-Latin or Irish-influenced biblical commentaries identified by Bernhard Bischoff (see n. 143). For some essential references see the section on "Biblical Commentaries" in Charles D. Wright, "Hiberno-Latin Literature." The Matthew commentary of "Frigulus" is one of those whose Irish origins or affiliations are disputed. See especially Lukas Dorfbauer, "Fortunatian von Aquileia und der Matthäus-Kommentar des 'Frigulus' (*CPL* 1121e)," *MJ* 50 (2015), 59–90. The commentary has now been edited

In "Towards the Identification of Old English Literary Ideas" Cross called on source scholars not only to read Hiberno-Latin texts, but also to "read and publish Latin manuscripts of early date, particulary for anonymous works."[158] The impetus for such research was to enable more precise answers to the question, "What are the actual words in Latin which the respective English writers saw?"[159] The surviving manuscripts of Latin texts are almost invariably at one remove or more from those used by vernacular homilists.[160] Moreover, source identifications have generally been made with reference to available printed editions, and those in the PL rarely supply variant readings, while anonymous and pseudonymous sermons such as the Pseudo-Augustinian ones in PL 39 are rarely the subject of critical editions.[161] A case in point is the Latin Doomsday sermon that Cross in 1982 demonstrated had been used by the author of Fadda I.[162] Two versions are reprinted in the PL, one among the spurious sermons of Augustine in PL 39 (*Sermo App.* 251), and another among the spuria

---

by Anthony J. Forte, *Friguli Commentarius in evangelium secundum Matthaeum*, Rarissima Mediaevalia 6 (Aschendorff, 2018), but see the important review by John Contreni in *The Medieval Review* 19.11.21, https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/tmr/article/view/28938. Accessed 2019 July 10. It is worth noting that none of the allegedly "Hiberno-Latin" material paralleled in Blickling III derives from the recently recovered late-Antique gospel commentary of Fortunatianus, which Dorfbauer shows to have been a main source for "Frigulus."

[158] Cross, "Towards the Identification," p. 79.

[159] Ibid., p. 83.

[160] A notable exception (though not involving homiletic texts) is Cross's discovery of the actual manuscript used by the Old English translators of the apocryphal *Gospel of Nicodemus* and *Vindicta Salvatoris*. See *Two Old English Apocrypha and Their Manuscript Source: The 'Gospel of Nichodemus' and 'The Avenging of the Saviour'*, ed. Cross, CSASE 19 (Cambridge, 1996).

[161] An essential guide to pseudonymous sermons is CPPM, 1A–B: *Opera Homiletica*, 2 vols., CCSL (Turnhout, 1990).

[162] Cross, "A Doomsday Passage in an Old English Homily for Lent," *Anglia* 100 (1982), 103–8.

of Ambrose in PL 17. Comparison with the two texts printed by Migne left a number of phrases and sentences unaccounted for, and Cross concluded that the homilist was thoroughly conversant with Doomsday commonplaces and added freely from memory to the Latin sermon as he translated it. A variant text of the Doomsday sermon unknown to Cross, however, has equivalents for most of these apparent additions, so Cross's assessment of the homilist's mode of composition must now be qualified.[163]

Cross also urged that Old English scholars, in the absence of modern critical editions, should search library catalogues to identify surviving manuscripts of a source text (with special attention to early manuscripts and manuscripts written or owned in pre-Conquest England) and then "weav[e] our way through the variants to create our author's text."[164] Although Cross did not attempt to edit the Doomsday sermon from manuscript sources, he later edited two other anonymous Latin sermons, the *Sermo de misericordia*[165] and the sermon "Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis,"[166] sources respectively for Vercelli X (as well as Ælfric, *CH* II, VII) and for Blickling XIV (as well as three Ælfrician homilies and the *Old English Martyrology*). These were more properly critical than composite editions, in which Cross printed a base manuscript with variant readings, but in the case of the *Sermo de misericordia*, Cross's choice of base manuscript was determined not by recension or even by superior readings, but by the consideration that the manuscript in question was "clearly such as Ælfric

[163] Wright, "A Doomsday Passage in an Old English Homily for Lent, Revisited," *Anglia* 128 (2010), 28–47.

[164] Cross, "Towards the Identification," p. 83.

[165] Cross, "A *Sermo de misericordia* in Old English Prose," *Anglia* 108 (1990), 429–40, supplementing an earlier composite edition by Wolfgang Becker, "The Latin Manuscript Sources of the Old English Translations of the Sermon *Remedia Peccatorum*," *MÆ* 45 (1976), 145–52.

[166] Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis': A Sermon for All Saints and Its Use in Old English Prose," *Traditio* 33 (1977), 101–35.

saw."[167] In the case of "Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis," the base manuscript chosen was the earliest, but was "collated with other early manuscripts as well as manuscripts at present in English libraries which are sometimes of English provenance."[168]

Cross's major editorial project was the unpublished Latin homiliary in Cambridge, Pembroke College 25. Helen Spencer had already discovered the immediate source of Vercelli III in this homiliary (see p. 000 above), but neither Spencer (a Middle English specialist) nor Old English specialists had followed up by reading the other sermons to see if there might be new sources for other homilies. Citing M. R. James's inventory of its contents, Cross pointed out that it contained many sermons that are not in the more widely disseminated homiliaries of Alanus of Farfa, Paul the Deacon, Smaragdus, Hrabanus Maurus, and Haymo of Auxerre, and he concluded: "Surely we now need to read these unidentified items."[169] By 1983 he had seen a microfilm of Pembroke 25, and in 1987 he published a full description of the homiliary,[170] which he now recognised as one of several manuscript witnesses to the Pembroke Homiliary. His monograph on Pembroke 25 showed that the homiliary transmitted the immediate sources—which he edited in the same way as other Latin source texts, as "a reading edition for Anglo-Saxonists" (p. vi)—for no fewer than eight anonymous homilies: Vercelli III, XIX–XXI, Assmann XI (HomS 13) and XII (HomS 16), Tristram III (HomS 45),

[167] Cross, "A *Sermo de misericordia*," 431.

[168] Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis'," 101.

[169] Cross, "Towards the Identification," p. 85.

[170] Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS 25*. See now the collaborative project *Cambridge, Pembroke College 25: A Transcription*, dir. Dot Porter and Paul E. Szarmach, online at https://schoenberginstitute.org/pembroke 25/ (accessed 2019 July 13), as well as Thomas N. Hall's "The Sources of the Pembroke 25 Homiliary" in the present volume.

and Belfour VI (HomS 15).[171] This discovery was comparable in significance to Cyril Smetana's that Ælfric had used the Homiliary of Paul the Deacon (a discovery that Cross had importantly supplemented).[172] In addition to establishing the immediate sources of these anonymous homilies, Cross established the currency of another massive homiliary in pre-Conquest England, and exemplified again how Latin sources were often transmitted to vernacular homilists through intermediaries. The implications for an assessment of the homilists' treatment of their sources were far-reaching. On the basis of antecedent sources alone, Cross had suggested that the author of Vercelli XIX had composed very freely, "whether from memory or brief consultation,"[173] and that Vercelli XX was probably not by the same author (as had been suggested by Paul Szarmach), since the two texts "differ in attitude towards their definable literary sources, and in manner of composition because of this … "[174] The subsequent discovery of the immediate source in the Pembroke Homiliary showed that he in fact translated rather closely and that all four homilies translate Pembroke-type items in a consistent way, corroborating the linguistic and stylistic evidence for the common

---

[171] All these homilies have entries by Mark Atherton in *Fontes* (1996). There are also slight indications that the author of Brotanek II (HomS 49 [Brot 2]) may also have used the homiliary (see Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS 25*, pp. 234–35. Mark Atherton, "The Sources of Brotanek Homily 2 (Cameron B.3.2.49)," *Fontes* (1996), does not record Cross's suggestions. Thomas N. Hall, "The Portents at Christ's Birth," has shown that a Pembroke item was probably also a source for Vercelli V and VI. For a complete listing of the Old English passages dependent on the Pembroke Homiliary see Hall, "The Sources of the Pembroke 25 Homiliary," pp. 000–000 in the present volume.

[172] Smetana, "Ælfric and the Early Medieval Homiliary," *Traditio* 15 (1959), 163–204; id., "Paul the Deacon's Patristic Anthology," in *The Old English Homily and Its Backgrounds*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach and Bernard F. Huppé (Albany, 1978), pp. 75–97; Cross, "Ælfric and the Mediaeval Homiliary – Objection and Contribution," *Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, Scripta minora* 4 (1961–62), 1–34.

[173] Bazire-Cross, p. 25.

[174] Ibid., p. 6.

authorship of Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI and enabling D. G. Scragg to make a strong circumstantial case (endorsed by Cross) that the entire set was composed by a homilist active during the Benedictine Reform period.[175]

A distinctive quality of Cross's source scholarship was that he often "showed his work." Förster and Willard favoured results-oriented exposition shorn of circumstantial details about how they had actually identified the sources in question, though sometimes it is possible to divine the process from the discoveries. Cross was fond of speculating about how scholars such as Förster and Willard had made their finds, and was given to anecdotal asides regarding the ways and means—whether systematic or serendipitous—of his own discoveries.[176] These asides are at once refreshing and instructive, conveying the excitement of discovery as well as something of the art of source scholarship that others might be able to apply in new contexts. Cross's characterisation of source scholars like himself as "humane antiquarians"[177] must sound quaint in a postmodern age when many academics in the humanities characterise themselves as "cultural critics," and his sympathetic yet detached

---

[175] Scragg, "An Old English Homilist of Archbishop Dunstan's Day," in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Korhammer and Karl Reichl (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 181–92; cf. Cross, "Vernacular Sermons in Old English," pp. 566–67. The discovery of the immediate source in the Pembroke Homiliary does not exhaust the possibilities for source identification. Michael Fox, "Vercelli Homilies XIX–XXI, the Ascension Day Homily in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162, and the Catechetical Tradition from Augustine to Wulfstan," in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Zacher and Orchard, pp. 276–77, draws attention to passages not paralleled in the Latin, arguing that in these bridging passages (as well as in the selection and ordering of material derived from his main Latin source) the homilist was influenced by the Augustinian tradition of the catechetical *narratio*.

[176] To mention just one example, see "The Literate Anglo-Saxon," pp. 82–83, for Cross's anecdote about a conversation with John C. Pope on the source of a passage in an Ælfrician homily.

[177] Cross, *Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25*, p. v.

effort to understand the "revealed mind" of medieval writers has given way to a more suspicious kind of critical distance that "interrogates" or "scrutinizes" their ideological biases (as well as those of the scholars who study them). Much has been gained by the ideological turn in Old English Studies studies, yet it has enhanced rather than diminished the intrinsic value of the work of source scholars whose discoveries still support investigations motivated by very different goals, and whose methods of research and analysis, despite inherent limitations, remain potent models.

Cross's legacy also endures institutionally in one of the two collaborative source projects that he helped to found, now called *Sources of Old English and Anglo-Latin Literary Culture*, which has forthcoming major entries on important homiletic source authors such as Caesarius of Arles.[178] The other sources project, *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*, has been shuttered, but its online archive includes invaluable entries on no fewer than twenty-one Vercelli homilies, seven Blickling homilies, nine Napier (Pseudo-Wulfstan) homilies, five Bazire-Cross homilies, three Assmann homilies, and three Irvine homilies, as well as a handful of other one-off anonymous homilies and homiletic saints' lives.

[To the type-setter: Please leave an empty line here.]

Perhaps what emerges most clearly from this survey of the work of these three pioneers—aside from the sheer magnitude of their contributions to our knowledge of the Latin sources of Old English anonymous homilies—is that source scholarship has been and probably always will be a work-in-progress. Early identifications of sources based on the Patrologia Latina, or on other editions from the nineteenth century or earlier, were inevitably weakly grounded on inadequate texts with few or no variant readings, scanty information about manuscript transmission, and sometimes faulty dating or attribution. Again, some early

[178] See n. 4 above. The *SOEALLC* Project will be transitioning from its temporary GitHub website to a new and more robust online platform with Amsterdam University Press.

source identifications have proven to be antecedent rather than immediate ones,[179] and we now know that many patristic and early medieval sources were consulted by Old English preachers either in florilegia or in homiliaries[180] such as the Pembroke Homiliary (in the case of a number of anonymous homilies), the homiliaries of Paul the Deacon, Haimo of Auxerre, and Smaragdus (in the case of so many of Ælfric's homilies), and the Homiliary of Angers (whose significance has only recently emerged).[181] Even when more reliable critical editions and scholarly studies of individual texts have been published, they have not always been fully exploited by subsequent Old English scholarship. Again, source scholars have tended to rely on published editions rather than going directly to the manuscripts, though Cross established a

[179] This has been stressed (with reference mainly to Ælfric) as a risk inherent in source studies by Joyce Hill, "Mapping the Anglo-Saxon Intellectual Landscape: The Risks and Rewards of Source-Study," in *Aspects of Anglo-Saxon and Medieval England*, ed. Michiko Ogura, Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature 54 (Frankfurt a. M., 2014), pp. 49–68. Of course, source scholars have been the ones to highlight that risk and to discover the intermediaries that we do know of.

[180] See the valuable survey by Mary Clayton, "Homiliaries and Preaching in Anglo-Saxon England," *Peritia* 4 (1985), 207–42; repr. with corrections in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. by Paul E. Szarmach, Basic Readings on Anglo-Saxon England 5 (New York, 2000), pp. 151–98.

[181] See Raymond Étaix, "L'homéliaire carolingien d'Angers," *RB* 104 (1994), 148–90. The recently discovered "Taunton fragments" of a bilingual Latin-OE copy suggest that there may once have been a complete OE translation of this homiliary. See Mechthild Gretsch, "The Taunton Fragment: A New Text from Anglo-Saxon England," *ASE* 33 (2004), 145–93; Helmut Gneuss, "The Homiliary of the Taunton Fragments," *N&Q* n.s. 52 (2005), 440–42; Aidan Conti, "The Taunton Fragment and the Homiliary of Angers: Context for New Old English," *RES* n.s. 60 (2009), 1–33; Winfried Rudolf, "The Homiliary of Angers in Tenth-Century England," *ASE* 39 (2011), 163–92. In addition to the homilies translated in the Taunton fragments themselves, a motif in HomU 15.1 (a variant version of Vercelli IX) and HomM 17, based ultimately on a redaction of the *Visio Pauli*, was mediated through this homiliary, as demonstrated by Stephen Pelle, "The Seven Pains of Hell: The Latin Source of an Old English Homiletic Motif," *RES* n.s. 62 (2011), 167–80.

new standard for working with unpublished manuscripts of source texts at a time when one still had to consult them *in situ* or order microfilms by post. As online digital facsimiles have become widely available, younger scholars such as Aidan Conti, Stephen Pelle, and Winfried Rudolf are making manuscript research the norm rather than the exception in source studies, and those of us old enough to have worked in both print and digital eras are in the best position to appreciate how transformative the digital revolution has been (and how game-changing ECHOE will be). The prospect for future refinements and new discoveries lies primarily in the manuscript record, since the PL, CSEL, and CCSL were so thoroughly harvested by Förster, Willard, and Cross, and then gleaned by subsequent scholars who have had the advantage of the online databases. While Cross urged Old English scholars to "read and publish Latin manuscripts of early date," I would urge that we not confine our research to manuscripts dating from the 1100 A.D. or earlier: some sources (or recensions of sources) used by Old English homilists may happen to survive only in later medieval manuscripts, and there may yet be new discoveries to be made in post-Conquest copies, perhaps even several centuries removed.[182]

If the pioneering era of large-scale discovery of new sources has passed,[183] the task of current and future generations of source scholars will be to move beyond the inadequacies of

[182] A case in point is the thirteenth-century Engelberg manuscript that currently affords the closest approximation to the lost immediate Latin source of Fadda I for its *Three Utterances* exemplum and immediately surrounding passages (see Wright, "More Latin Sources for the Old English 'Three Utterances' Homilies"). See also Stephen Pelle's identification of closer thirteenth-century manuscript redactions to a Sunday Letter homily in this volume.

[183] I do not by any means wish to imply that no major new discoveries are yet to be made. As recently as 2009, Samantha Zacher located the source of a previously unsourced Vercelli homily: "The Source of Vercelli VII: An Address to Women," in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Zacher and Orchard, pp. 98–150. In addition, to assist in source identification we now have access to an array of scholarly resources, both print and digital, that were unavailable to our pioneers.

early identifications by exploiting more recent scholarship on the sources themselves, especially up-to-date critical editions, not only for a fuller conspectus of variant recensions and readings of source texts, but also for more accurate attributions and better understanding of their modes of transmission. Yet since variorum editions with exhaustive apparatus of variants are rare, it will often be necessary to investigate the manuscripts themselves in order to reconstruct an Old English homilist's immediate sources as closely as possible (barring the unlikely recovery of any manuscript actually used by an Old English homilist). Moreover, as I have stressed in a previous essay, the more important work of analysing and interpreting Old English homilists' use of Latin sources, and drawing out the implications for textual criticism, for lexicography, for stylistics and translation studies, and for cultural and intellectual history, has barely begun.[184] This is not because source scholars to date have simply failed to undertake such kinds of interpretation. Although Förster focused primarily on the philological implications of his source discoveries, and Willard did not always follow up his own with close readings of the homilists' adaptations of them, Cross—for whom sources were always an entry-point into early English "literary ideas" and "patterns of thought"—dealt extensively with historical, literary, and doctrinal matters in the homilies he sourced.[185] And much recent

[184] Sourcing texts, like other philological procedures, is itself already a form of interpretation, as asserted by Allen Frantzen, who goes on to suggest that for source scholars "the rest of the work with the corpus – interpreting it, for example, through literary criticism – is secondary" (*Desire for Origins: Old English, New Language, and Teaching the Tradition* [New Brunswick, NJ, 1991], p. 91). In my view as a source scholar, "interpreting" the corpus in the latter sense is "secondary" in only one sense—that to whatever extent sources are to be used as supporting evidence for interpretation (and they do not always need to be), identification of those sources must by definition have preceded their interpretive use. More importantly, source identifications are open-ended in the kinds of interpretations that they may support or even enable.

[185] The close connection between sources and ideas in Cross's work is well brought out by Thomas N. Hall, preface to *Via Crucis*, ed. Hall et al., pp. xiv–xv.

work has pursued the implications of source discoveries in manifold directions.[186] For all that, the potential implications of the use of sources by Old English homilists—including the range of questions that might be asked and of the approaches that might be brought to bear in answering them—are so vast that what has been done to date can be no more than a beginning. Conducting that work confidently, however, requires a firm foundation of reliable and exacting source identification. The *SASLC* Project (now *SOEALLC*) and *Fontes*, consolidating and supplementing the work of these pioneers and other early source scholars, have helped establish such a foundation, albeit in fits and starts. As the director of the ECHOE project work on Latin sources, Thomas N. Hall will now be registering, updating, and supplementing the scholarship that began in the late nineteenth century with Zupitza and his student Förster, and that was continued by Willard and Cross through the twentieth century. The ultimate goal of ECHOE is to comprehensively inventory the Latin sources of the entire corpus of anonymous homilies. And with that, a new era will have begun.

[186] As I have limited references to more recent work to contributions that directly engage the source scholarship by these pioneers that I have chosen to highlight, I will mention here only one notable recent book that integrates source study (taking account of vernacular as well as Latin sources) with wide-ranging historical and literary interpretation, especially stylistics: Zacher, *Preaching the Converted*.

L1 The Sources of the Pembroke 25 Homiliary

Thomas N. Hall

Cambridge, Pembroke College 25 is one of eleven surviving manuscripts that preserve at least parts of a sermon collection known as the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres, a collection compiled somewhere in Frankish territory, perhaps in the vicinity of Tours, during the ninth or early-tenth century, and a collection that was well known in late Anglo-Saxon England.[1] This collection was first studied in detail by Henri Barré, who named it the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres because the oldest manuscript witness then known to him was once in the possession of the abbey of Saint-Père-en-Vallée at Chartres, where it may have been written in the late-tenth or early-eleventh century.[2] However, that Chartres manuscript, which today bears the library shelfmark Chartres, BM 25, was all but destroyed in 1944 when Chartres was bombed, so scholars interested in this homiliary have had to turn elsewhere to learn about its contents, and it so happens that of all the surviving manuscripts, Pembroke 25 provides the fullest and most reliable guide to the original collection.[3] The eleven surviving manuscripts of the collection can be listed as follows, in rough chronological order, with brief

---

[1] The argument for the collection's geographical origin at or near Tours was put forward by François Dolbeau, "Du nouveau sur un sermonnaire de Cambridge," *Scriptorium* 42 (1988), 255–57. On the date of the collection, see n. 20 below. My thanks to Stephen Pelle and Charles D. Wright for their helpful comments on a draft of this essay.

[2] Henri Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre*, Studi e testi 225 (Vatican City, 1962), pp. 17–18.

[3] On the bombing of Chartres, see Roger Joly, "Bombardement de Chartres, 26 mai 1944," *Bulletin de la Société archéologique d'Eure-et-Loir* 47 (1995), 48–55.

summaries of contents and references to important studies:[4]

1. **Chicago, Newberry Library 1** (Southern France, s. x^2), formerly Cheltenham, Phillipps 1326: a collection of 78 sermons, of which four (arts. 65, 67, 77, 78) are paralleled in the Saint-Père collection (= Pembroke 25, arts. 75, 77, 56–63, 64). Described by Heinrich Schenkl, *Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Britannica*, 3 vols. in 1, Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften 121 (Vienna, 1891–1908; repr. Hildesheim, 1969), no. 1182; Maurice P. Cunningham, "Contents of the Newberry Library Homiliary," *SE* 7 (1955), 267–301; Henri Barré, "Sermons marials inédits 'in Natali Domini,'" *Marianum: Ephemerides Mariologiae* 25 (1963), 50–56; and Paul Saenger, *A Catalogue of the Pre-1500 Western Manuscript Books at the Newberry Library* (Chicago, 1989), pp. 3–9. Cunningham (p. 267) dates the manuscript to the early-ninth century; Saenger (p. 3) dates it to s. xi^1; but in a detailed letter to J. E. Cross of 10 May 1974, Bernhard Bischoff dated it to s. x^2: see J. E. Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis': A Sermon for All Saints, and Its Use in Old English Prose," *Traditio* 33 (1977), 102, n. 11.

2. **Canterbury, Cathedral Library, Add. 127/12** (Southern England, s. $x^{3/3}$): an incomplete

[4] This list includes only manuscripts that preserve at least two sermons or sermon fragments from the original collection. Excluded are those that preserve only a single sermon, such as the manuscript recently discussed by Winfried Rudolf, "An Early Manuscript Witness of the Homiliaries of Angers and St. Père de Chartres in Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, MS Msc.Bibl.30a," *JML* 27 (2017), 1–40, since the principal manuscript Rudolf discusses (Bamberg, Msc.Bibl.30a, s. $x^{in.}$) contains an incomplete copy of only one Saint-Père sermon (= Pembroke 25 art. 36). Rudolf conjectures (12–17) that the manuscript from which the Bamberg fragment derives originally contained a second sermon from the Saint-Père collection as well (= Pembroke 25 art. 38), but that sermon does not survive in the extant fragment.

central bifolium containing two sermon fragments (= Pembroke 25, arts. 15 and 16). Described by N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries. II: Abbotsford–Keele* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 316–17; Richard Gameson, *The Earliest Books of Canterbury Cathedral: Manuscripts and Fragments to c. 1200*, Canterbury Sources 4 (London, 2008), pp. 79–83; and Gneuss/Lapidge, no. 210.

3. **Chartres, BM 25, fols. 119r–62r** (s. x/xi, prov. Saint-Père, Chartres): burned in 1944. The original number of sermons is unknown. The only account of this part of the manuscript's contents published before 1944 appears in the *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements. Tome XI: Chartres* (Paris, 1890), p. 12, which reads in its entirety: "Fol. 119–162. Receuil d'homélies; le début manque. Commencement de la première qui soit complète: 'XXXII. Omelia in die sancto Pascels (*sic*). Spiritus Sanctus per prophetam populo Christi ...' La fin manque, les feuillets 157–162 sont mutilés" (Fols. 119–62. Collection of homilies; the beginning is lost. The incipit of the first complete one reads: 'XXXII. Homily for Easter Day. The Holy Spirit through the prophet to the people of Christ ...' The end is missing; folios 157–62 are damaged). The sermon identified in this description corresponds to Pembroke 25, art. 33, which is rubricated ".xxxii. Omelia in die sancto Paschae" and has the same incipit. The brief notice of this manuscript in the "Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum bibliothecae civitatis Carnotensis," *Analecta Bollandiana* 8 (1889), 90, dates fols. 119r–62r to "saec. XI." The Chartres fragments are newly described by J. E. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25: A Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, KCLMS 1 (London, 1987), pp. 45–49.

4. **Angers, BM 236, fols. 6r–128r** (France, s. xi$^{2?}$; prov. Saint-Aubin, Angers): a principal witness to the Carolingian Homiliary of Angers, containing 60 sermons and Office

lections, four of which derive from the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres (= Pembroke 25, arts. 20, 36, 40, 93). Thorough description by Raymond Étaix, "L'Homéliaire carolingien d'Angers," *RB* 104 (1994), 148–90, esp. 149–60.

5. **London, BL, Royal 5. E. xix, fols. 21r–36r** (Salisbury, s. xi$^{4/4}$ or xi$^{ex.}$): 12 sermons (= Pembroke 25, arts. 76, 1, 2, end of 27, 77, 29, 34, 36, beginning of 39, 37, 52, 53). Briefly described by G. P. Warner and J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Royal and King's Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 4 vols. (London, 1921), 1:118; Teresa Webber, *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral c. 1075–c. 1125*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford, 1992), p. 145; Richard Gameson, *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c. 1066–1130)*, British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship Monographs (Oxford, 1999), no. 502; and Gneuss/Lapidge, no. 461.

6. **Cambridge, Pembroke College 25** (Bury St Edmunds, s. xi/xii): 96 sermons according to the detailed description by Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 19–43, who relies on Henri Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens*, pp. 17–18, for the enumeration of arts. 1–77. Briefly described by Schenkl, *Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Britannica*, no. 2527; Gneuss/Lapidge, no. 131; and most fully by Rebecca Rushforth, "Cambridge, Pembroke College 25: The Manuscript and Its Historical Context" (presently published online as part of the Digital Pembroke 25 project at http://www.dotporterdigital.org/pembroke/essays/Rushforth.pdf (accessed 2019 November 1), who dates the manuscript to "within fifteen years on either side of 1100" (pp. 9–10). An eleventh-century Bury origin is accepted by N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd ed., Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 3 (London, 1964), p. 17; R. M. Thomson, "The Library of Bury St Edmunds Abbey in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *Speculum* 47 (1972), 625–27 and nn. 39,

50, and 55; Richard Sharpe, "Reconstructing the Medieval Library of Bury St Edmunds Abbey: The Lost Catalogue of Henry of Kirkstead," in *Bury St Edmunds: Medieval Art, Architecture, Archaeology and Economy*, ed. Antonia Gransden, British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 20 (Leeds, 1998), p. 213; and Gameson, *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England*, no. 112. David N. Dumville, "On the Dating of Some Late Anglo-Saxon Liturgical Manuscripts," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 10 (1991), 41, dates it to "the earlier twelfth century" on the basis of ink and formatting.

7. **Grenoble, BM 278 (470)** (Eastern France, s. xii; prov. Pierre-Châtel): a collection of 78 sermons, ten of which derive from the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres (= Pembroke 25, arts. 20, 38, 36, 40, 24, 93, 16, 15, 29, and 92). Brief summary of contents with identifications of only six sermons by P. Fournier, E. Maignien, and A. Prudhomme, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements. Tome VII: Grenoble* (Paris, 1889), pp. 112–13. Much fuller description by Étaix, "L'Homéliaire carolingien d'Angers," 160–64. The sermon at fols. 18r–30r adapted from the *Evangelium Nicodemi* (not a Saint-Père sermon) is described by Zbigniew Izydorczyk, *Manuscripts of the 'Evangelium Nicodemi': A Census*, Subsidia Mediaevalia 21 (Toronto, 1993), pp. 60–61, who suggests, based on correspondence with Raymond Étaix, that the manuscript was once in the possession of the Carthusian monastery of Pierre-Châtel in the diocese of Belley, northwest of Lyon.

8. **Paris, BnF, lat. 3794, fols. 18r–31r** (?Germany, s. xii): the Carolingian Homiliary of Beaune, containing 106 sermons in all, of which seven (= Pembroke 25, arts. 15–21) derive from the Saint-Père collection. The manuscript's contents are thoroughly described by Raymond Étaix, "Le sermonnaire carolingien de Beaune," *Revue des études*

augustiniennes 25 (1979), 106–49, whose study formed the basis for the detailed inventory of contents in the *Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits latins. Tome VII (Nos 3776 à 3835): Homéliaires* (Paris, 1988), pp. 155–66.

9. **Cambridge, St John's College 42 (B. 20), fols. 13r–62v and 70v–71v** (?Worcester, s. xii): fols. 13r–62v contain a set of 65 sermons, 63 of which derive from the Saint-Père Homiliary (= Pembroke 25, arts. 3–5, 7–27, 29–48, 50–55, and 65–76); then at the beginning of a second set of sermons at fols. 70v–121r there appears a 64th sermon from the Saint-Père collection (= Pembroke 25, art. 89). Fullest description of the manuscript's contents, but with very few identifications, by M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 57–64. The connection between these sermons and Pembroke 25 is discussed by J. E. Cross, "Wulfstan's *De Anticristo* in a Twelfth-Century Worcester Manuscript," *ASE* 20 (1991), 203–20, who catalogues the second set of sermons.

10. **Lincoln, Cathedral Library 199, fols. 213r–345r** (England, s. xii$^{med.}$–xii$^{3/4}$): a large number of sermons and saints' lives, including 62 that derive from the Saint-Père collection (= Pembroke 25, arts. 1–5, 7–27, 29–48, 50, 52–63, 65–67). Thorough description by Rodney M. Thomson, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 159–61.

11. **Oxford, Balliol College 240, fols. 56r–136r** (England, s. xiv): 94 sermons total (= Pembroke 25, arts. 1–27, 29–48, 50–96). Brief summary of contents but without identification of individual sermons by R. A. B. Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College Oxford* (Oxford, 1963), p. 261. The contents are collated against other manuscripts of the Saint-Père collection by Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*,

pp. 19–43.

The exact contents of the original collection are difficult to determine in part because the contents of the oldest manuscript known to Barré (Chartres, BM 25) are now almost entirely lost to us and were in fact already damaged and incomplete before the 1944 bombing, to judge from the 1890 catalogue description, which states that nearly half the collection was missing at that time and the final six folios were *mutilés*. But Barré, relying on the existence of parallel texts in four other manuscripts (Pembroke 25, St John's 42, Royal 5. E. xix, and BnF, lat. 3794), deduced that the original Saint-Père collection must have contained a total of 77 sermons, corresponding to Pembroke 25, arts. 1–77.[5] This number requires some interpretation, however, since it does not in actuality represent 77 complete and independent sermons. To begin with, Barré overlooked the Easter Sunday sermon at Pembroke 25, fols. 75v–77r, which comes between the texts he numbered arts. 32 and 33; this sermon was later designated art. 32a by Cross in his revised 1987 inventory, bringing the total number of items in this part of the manuscript to 78.[6] In addition, three other items that might properly be regarded as individual texts were divided by Barré into multiple sermons to accord with the divisions and numbering in the manuscript: thus the early-ninth-century sermon for All Saints beginning "Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis" occupies arts. 56–63,[7] while arts. 68–72 comprise a single cluster of unsourced moral injunctions, each ending with a separate benediction, and arts. 78–88 consist of a single composite sermon on the canonical hours

[5] Barré was evidently unaware of Chicago, Newberry 1, Canterbury, Add. 127/12, Grenoble, BM 278, Lincoln Cathedral 199, and Balliol 240.

[6] Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25: A Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, KCLMS 1 (London, 1987), p. 32.

[7] On the possible authorship of this sermon by Helisachar (d. before 840 A.D.), the court chaplain to Louis the Pious, see below, p. 000.

based on Hrabanus Maurus's *De institutione clericorum*, Gregory the Great's *Regula pastoralis*, and the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis*. If we count each of these three groups of lections as a single item, and if we include the omitted art. 32a, then the number of sermons in this part of the manuscript (the part containing Barré's arts. 1–77) drops to 57 (77 + 1 [art. 32a] - 7 [63 - 56] - 4 [72 - 68] - 10 [88 - 78]). In addition, one sermon in Pembroke 25, the Palm Sunday sermon which Barré and Cross both designated art. 28, appears only in Pembroke 25 and in no other manuscripts of the collection, so that it is possible that this sermon is a late addition to the collection that should not be counted among the original contents of the Saint-Père Homiliary. If so, a renumbering of the conjectured contents of the original Saint-Père collection, at least as Barré understood it, would take us down to 56 sermons.

A significant challenge to this reconstruction, however, is the fact that four later manuscripts of the collection contain sermons that also appear in Pembroke 25 but that *follow* art. 77, which Barré thought marked the outermost limit of the original collection. Angers, BM 236, from eleventh-century France, contains copies of Pembroke 25, arts. 29, 36, and 91. St John's 42, probably from twelfth-century Worcester, contains a copy of Pembroke 25, art. 89, a "Predicatio communis omnibus populis" that employs the familiar trope of the Seven Joys of Heaven and a short *ubi sunt* passage, both devices frequently exploited by Old English homilists.[8] Grenoble, BM 278, from twelfth-century France, contains incomplete copies of

[8] On the Seven Joys of Heaven, see R. E. McNally, *Der irische Liber de numeris: Eine Quellenanalyse des pseudo-Isidorischen Liber de numeris* (Munich, 1957), p. 116; Thomas D. Hill, "The Seven Joys of Heaven in *Christ III* and Old English Homiletic Texts," *N&Q* n.s. 16 (1969), 165–66; Hildegard L. C. Tristram, "Stock Descriptions of Heaven and Hell in Old English Literature," *NM* 75 (1976), 104–5; Bazire-Cross, pp. 11–12; Clare A. Lees, "Theme and Echo in an Anonymous Old English Homily for Easter," *Traditio* 42 (1986), 127; Charles D. Wright, *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*, CSASE 6 (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 102–5 and 228; Martha Bayless and Michael Lapidge, eds., *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*, Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 14

Pembroke 25, arts. 92 and 93, the first a sermon based on Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 16, and the second a sermon based on Alcuin's *De virtutibus et vitiis*. And most impressively, the fourteenth-century English manuscript Balliol 240 contains a total of 94 sermons that match up, sermon for sermon, with every single item in Pembroke 25 save two, omitting only Pembroke 25, arts. 28 and 49, although the index of contents at the beginning of Balliol 240 does include a listing for art. 49, so that Balliol 240 comes very close to replicating the entire contents of Pembroke 25. For reasons that will be spelled out more fully below in a discussion of the collection's style and sources, Balliol 240, Grenoble, BM 278, and Pembroke 25 almost certainly represent not an expanded version of the original collection but the full extent of the original collection itself, which must have contained all 96 sermons. Only Pembroke 25 contains all 77 sermons from the collection as reconstructed by Barré, and only Pembroke 25 contains all 96 sermons from the complete original collection, and this is why it is the most important witness to the collection as a whole. (For a fresh inventory of the manuscript's contents, see the Appendix below.)

Scholars of early medieval England have become increasingly curious about the Saint-Père Homiliary as we have come to realise that several different copies or versions of this collection were in England in the tenth and eleventh centuries which provided the Latin sources behind a number of Old English homilies. As Cross demonstrated in his 1987 monograph, the eight Old English homilies known as Assmann XI and XII, Belfour VI,

---

(Dublin, 1998), pp. 142–43 (no. 177) and 239–40; and Thomas N. Hall, "Preaching at Winchester in the Early Twelfth Century," *JEGP* 104 (2005), 199–201. On the *ubi sunt* motif, see the seminal essay by J. E. Cross, "'Ubi Sunt' Passages in Old English – Sources and Relationships," *Vetenskaps societeten i Lund Årsbok* (1956), 25–44; Claudia Di Sciacca, "The *ubi sunt* Motif and the Soul-and-Body Legend in Old English Homilies: Sources and Relationships," *JEGP* 105 (2006), 365–87; and Di Sciacca, *Finding the Right Words: Isidore's 'Synonyma' in Anglo-Saxon England*, Toronto Old English Series 19 (Toronto, 2008), pp. 105–59.

Tristram III, and Vercelli III, XIX, XX, and XXI all translate select passages or whole sermons from the Saint-Père collection (P25).[9] These textual relationships can be mapped out as follows:

Assmann XI (HomS 13), lines 1–67, 72–79 : P25 art. 20

Assmann XI (HomS 13), lines 79–144 : P25 art. 21

Assmann XII (HomS 16), lines 5–7, 81–158 : P25 art. 23

Belfour VI (HomS 15), 50/1–3, 50/7–52/5, 52/8–23, 54/14–17, 54/25–56/12, 56/23–58/15 : P25 art. 22

Tristram III (HomS 45), lines 38–48, 193–241 : P25 art. 41

Tristram III (HomS 45), lines 66–190 : P25 art. 42

Vercelli III (HomS 11.2), complete : P25 art. 22

Vercelli XIX (HomS 34), lines 1–11 : P25 art. 1

Vercelli XIX (HomS 34), lines 46–48 : P25 art. 34

Vercelli XIX (HomS 34), lines 61–67 : P25 art. 36

Vercelli XIX (HomS 34), lines 69–85 : P25 art. 38

Vercelli XIX (HomS 34), lines 85–87 : P25 art. 91

[9] For the possibility that a ninth Old English homily, Brotanek II (HomS 49 [Brot 2]), relies on a brief passage in Pembroke 25 art. 25 for its enumeration of the joys of heaven, see Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, p. 234. And for the likelihood that a version of Pembroke 25 art. 5 provided the source for the portents at Christ's birth in two other Old English homilies, Vercelli V (HomS 1 [ScraggVerc5]) and VI (HomU 10 [ScraggVerc6]), see Thomas N. Hall, "The Portents at Christ's Birth in Vercelli Homilies V and VI: Some Analogues from Medieval Sermons and Biblical Commentaries," in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, TASS 4 (Toronto, 2009), pp. 62–97. Parallels between Pembroke 25 arts. 25 and 50 and Fadda I (HomM 5) are demonstrated by Charles D. Wright, "More Latin Sources for the Old English 'Three Utterances' Homilies," *MS* 77 (2015), 52–55 and 60–61. See also Esther Lemmerz's contribution to this volume for the sources of Assmann XIII.

Vercelli XIX (HomS 34), lines 88–97 : P25 art. 38

Vercelli XIX (HomS 34), lines 106–48 : P25 art. 36

Vercelli XIX (HomS 34), lines 149–64 : P25 art. 40

Vercelli XIX (HomS 34), lines 173–76 : P25 art. 42

Vercelli XX (HomS 38), lines 28–34 : P25 art. 52

Vercelli XX (HomS 38), lines 35–56 : P25 art. 22

Vercelli XX (HomS 38), lines 57–179 : P25 art. 93

Vercelli XXI (HomM 13), lines 1–4 : P25 art. 91

Vercelli XXI (HomM 13), lines 20–25 : P25 art. 24

Vercelli XXI (HomM 13), lines 29–32 : P25 art. 40

Vercelli XXI (HomM 13), lines 43–45 : P25 art. 39

Vercelli XXI (HomM 13), lines 48–55 : P25 art. 91

Vercelli XXI (HomM 13), lines 57–86 : P25 art. 90

Vercelli XXI (HomM 13), lines 87–125 : P25 art. 34

Vercelli XXI (HomM 13), lines 239–42 : P25 art. 50

Vercelli XXI (HomM 13), lines 242–47 : P25 art. 25

Vercelli XXI (HomM 13), lines 249–52 : P25 art. 48

Vercelli XXI (HomM 13), lines 253–56 : P25 art. 42

Collectively these eight Old English homilies translate or paraphrase passages from no fewer than twenty sermons in the Saint-Père collection, corresponding to Pembroke 25, arts. 1, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 48, 50, 52, 90, 91, and 93. Vercelli XIX and XXI in particular are virtuoso examples of what are often referred to as composite homilies,

stitched together from multiple sources.[10] Vercelli XIX is concocted from bits of nine different sermons in the Saint-Père Homiliary; Vercelli XXI draws from eleven.[11] Most of the Saint-Père sermons consulted by these early English homilists come from the first half of the collection, but the author of Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI made use of Pembroke 25, arts. 90, 91, and 93, so he must have had access to a complete version of the collection like those in Pembroke 25 and Balliol 240.

The fundamental questions that we wish we could answer about when and where anonymous Old English homilies were written, by whom and for what purpose, are notoriously resistant to clear and satisfying answers, but these eight Old English homilies probably represent the work not of eight different authors or compilers but just three, since current wisdom holds that the three texts known as Assmann XI and XII, and Belfour VI were all probably written by the same author,[12] whereas Vercelli III was probably written by a

[10] On Old English composite homilies, see M. R. Godden, "Old English Composite Homilies from Winchester," *ASE* 4 (1975), 57–65; Mary Swan, "Holiness Remodelled: Theme and Technique in Old English Composite Homilies," in *Models of Holiness in Medieval Sermons: Proceedings of the International Symposium (Kalamazoo, 4–7 May 1995)*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle, Textes et études du moyen âge 5 (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1996), pp. 35–46; D. G. Scragg, *Dating and Style in Old English Composite Homilies*, H. M. Chadwick Memorial Lectures 9 (Cambridge, 1998); Nancy M. Thompson, "*Hit Segð on Halgum Bocum*: The Logic of Composite Old English Homilies," *PQ* 81 (2002), 383–419; Joyce Tally Lionarons, "Textual Appropriation and Scribal (Re)Performance in a Composite Homily: The Case for a New Edition of Wulfstan's *De Temporibus Anticristi*," in *Old English Literature in Its Manuscript Context*, ed. Lionarons, Medieval European Studies 5 (Morgantown, WV, 2004), pp. 67–93; and Hiroshi Ogawa, *Language and Style in Old English Composite Homilies*, MRTS 361 (Tempe, Arizona, 2010).

[11] See the source notes in the lower deck of *VH*, pp. 315–26 and 351–62.

[12] The common authorship of Assmann XI and XII and Belfour VI (as well as Brotanek II) is asserted without careful demonstration by Karl Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, Schweizer Anglistischer Arbeiten 23 (Berne, 1950), pp.

different author, and the four homilies known as Tristram III and Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI were all probably written by a third author working in Canterbury in the second half of the tenth century.[13] It is conceivable that all three homilists were working at the same time and in the same place and had access to the same library resources, but that is not very likely, and it may be more realistic to suppose that these three homilists were writing in different ecclesiastical centres using different materials. If so, then each of these authors had a separate copy of the Saint-Père Homiliary at his disposal, which means that there must have been at least three separate copies of the collection in England in the tenth and eleventh centuries when these eight Old English homilies were written. In fact, as many as *seven* different copies can be posited in English libraries between the tenth and early twelfth centuries and placed in a relative chronology to one another. First, if one of these Old English homilists (the author of Tristram III and Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI) was writing in Canterbury during the pontificate of Archbishop Dunstan between 959 and 988 A.D., as Professor Scragg has elegantly argued, then at least one copy of the Saint-Père Homiliary must have been available in Canterbury by the 980s.[14] The oldest surviving manuscript witness to the collection that can be placed in

178–82. Jost's argument is weighed and cautiously accepted by Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 232–35.

[13] The common authorship of Tristram III and Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI is convincingly demonstrated by Donald Scragg, "The Compilation of the Vercelli Book," *ASE* 2 (1973), 194–95 and 203–4; Paul Szarmach, "The Vercelli Homilies: Style and Structure," in *The Old English Homily and Its Backgrounds,* ed. P. Szarmach and B. F. Huppé (Albany, 1978), pp. 244 and 248; and D. G. Scragg, "An Old English Homilist of Archbishop Dunstan's Day," in *Words, Texts, and Manucripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Korhammer (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 181–92.

[14] J. E. Cross, "Vernacular Sermons in Old English," in *The Sermon*, ed. Beverly Mayne Kienzle, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 81–83 (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 561–96, dates the composition of Tristram III and

England is Canterbury, Cathedral Library, Add. 127/12, now a fragment consisting of two folios containing parts of two sermons that were copied in Southern England, possibly Kent, in the final third of the tenth century, thus quite possibly a remnant of the very manuscript consulted by Professor Scragg's Canterbury homilist, but if not, then a second witness to the collection that can be placed in tenth-century England.[15] A third possible witness (albeit on very thin evidence) may have been located at Worcester in the late-eleventh century since a copy of Pembroke 25, art. 15, a sermon for the Purification of the Virgin Mary that exists almost exclusively in copies of the Saint-Père collection, was incorporated into the Worcester recension of the "Cotton-Corpus Legendary" in London, BL, Cotton Nero E. i, pt. 1 (Worcester, this part s. xi$^{3/4}$), fols. 143r–44r. A fourth witness is the string of 12 sermons embedded in Royal 5. E. xix, which was produced at Salisbury in the final quarter of the eleventh century.[16] A fifth witness is Pembroke 25 itself, which was written at Bury St Edmunds within fifteen years or so of the year 1100 A.D., possibly during the abbacy of Baldwin (1065–97/8).[17] And at some point during this period, two additional copies of the collection were consulted by the author of Vercelli III and the author of Assmann XI and XII and Belfour VI (if in fact these two homilists were not working in the same library). For over a century before Pembroke 25 was written, in other words, multiple copies or versions of the Saint-Père Homiliary were available in England—certainly in Canterbury and Salisbury and

---

Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI to "circa 960 A.D." (p. 567), with the implication that a copy of the Saint-Père Homiliary must have been available in Canterbury before then, but that date is probably too narrow.

[15] Gameson, *The Earliest Books of Canterbury Cathedral*, pp. 79–83.

[16] G. P. Warner and J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Royal and King's Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 4 vols. (London, 1921), 1:118; Teresa Webber, *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral c. 1075–c. 1125*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford, 1992), p. 145.

[17] See above, p. 000. Of course, if Pembroke 25 was copied at Bury St Edmunds, then it was copied from an exemplar, which means that at one point there were at least two copies of the collection at Bury St Edmunds.

Bury St Edmunds but probably in other places as well—and the contents of this collection should therefore be of interest to anyone curious about the Latin ecclesiastical literature that was being copied and read and translated in England in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

A substantial number of the sources of the collection were identified by Cross in 1987,[18] but a few of his identifications now require qualification or correction. I begin by listing the sources which Cross identified in his inventory of the manuscript's contents in alphabetical order along with an indication in square brackets of which articles in Pembroke 25 borrow or quote from each source text:

Adomnán, *De locis sanctis* (CPL 2332) [arts. 31, 50]

Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* [arts. 20, 22, 23, 25, 48, 91, 93, 94, 95]

Alcuin, *De vita s. Martini* (BHL 5625) [art. 65]

Alcuin, *Sermo de transitu s. Martini* (BHL 5626) [art. 66]

Amalarius, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* [arts. 16, 31]

Ambrose, *In Lucam* (CPL 143) [art. 15]

Antiphons and Responses, many taken from the Pseudo-Gregorian *Liber Responsalis*:

René-Jean Hesbert, *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii*, 6 vols., Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, Series Maior, Fontes 7–12 (Rome, 1963–79), nos. 1474 [art. 55], 1552 [art. 14], 1553 [art. 14], 1554 [art. 14], 1566 [art. 49], 1768 [art. 14], 1788 [art. 14], 2762 [art. 49], 2925 [art. 15], 3078 [art. 15], 3093 [arts. 5, 7], 3105 [art. 49], 3425 [art. 9], 3678 [art. 14], 3757 [art. 55], 3852 [art. 51], 4079 [art. 41], 4091 [art. 7], 5062 [art. 14], 6165 [art. 49], 6535 [art. 55], 6715 [art. 55], 6759 [art. 15], 6821 [art. 13], 6826 [art. 55], 6851 [art. 49], 6854 [art. 51], 6858 [art. 7], 6859 [art. 5], 6867 [art. 49], 7068 [art. 7], 7151 [art. 55], 7199 [art. 51], 7455 [art. 51], 7569 [art. 7], 7834 [art. 55]

[18] See the detailed notes on the sermons' contents in Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 19–43.

Apparitio s. Michaelis archangelis (BHL 5956b) [art. 55]

Augustine, *Sermo* Mai 80 [art. 30]

Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* (CPL 278) [art. 29, 32a]

Bede, *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum* (CPL 1357) [art. 41]

Bible [passim]

Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones* (CPL 1008): *Sermo* 3 [arts. 1, 24], *Sermo* 13 [arts. 23, 47], *Sermo* 16 [art. 92], *Sermo* 57 [arts. 18, 24, 34], *Sermo* 146 [art. 19], *Sermo* 183 [art. 20], *Sermo* 187 [arts. 2, 3], *Sermo* 188 [arts. 2, 4, 21], *Sermo* 194 [art. 13], *Sermo* 197 [art. 18], *Sermo* 199 [art. 21], *Sermo* 202 [art. 29], *Sermo* 207 [art. 38], *Sermo* 208 [art. 39], *Sermo* 216 [arts. 2, 44], *Sermo* 223 [art. 73], *Sermo* 227 [art. 77]

Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum* (CPL 900) [art. 33]

Catechesis Celtica [arts. 26, 27, 29]

Collectio canonum Hibernensis (CPL 1794) [arts. 1, 22, 25, 37, 78–88, 90, 91]

Cyprian, *De mortalitate* (CPL 44) [art. 63]

Dynamius Patricius (?), *Epistola ad discipulum* (CPL 1058) [art. 89]

Eusebius/Rufinus, *Historia ecclesiastica* (CPG 3495) [art. 35]

Evangelium Pseudo-Matthaei (BHL 5334–42) [art. 11]

Gildas, *De excidio Britanniae* (CPL 1319) [art. 90]

Gregory the Great, *Homiliae xl in Evangelia* (CPL 1711): *Hom*. 2 *in Evang*. [art. 26], *Hom*. 8 *in Evang.* [art. 6], *Hom*. 12 *in Evang*. [art. 76], *Hom*. 15 *in Evang*. [art. 17], *Hom*. 29 *in Evang*. [art. 41], *Hom*. 30 *in Evang*. [art. 43]

Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis* (CPL 1712) [arts. 78–88]

Helisachar (?), “Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis” (BHL 6332d; CPL 1368) [*sermo* 71]) [arts. 55–63]

Hrabanus Maurus, *De institutione clericorum* [arts. 22, 31, 32, 43, 48, 78–88]

Isidore, *Etymologiae* (CPL 1186) [arts. 54, 55]

Jerome, *In Mattheum* (CPL 590) [arts. 26?, 27?, 30, 33]

Liber questionum in evangeliis (CPL 1168) [art. 11]

Maximus of Turin, *Sermones* (CPL 219a): *Sermo* 90 [art. 37]

Passio s. Andreae apostoli (BHL 428) [art. 67]

Passio ss. Petri et Pauli (BHL 6657) [art. 45?]

Protevangelium Iacobi (BHL 5342c) [art. 51]

Pseudo-Abdias, *Virtutes apostolorum* (BHL 4316) [art. 10]

Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 112 [art. 12], *Sermo* 123 [art. 7], *Sermo* 136 [arts. 14, 34, 42], *Sermo* 160 [art. 35], *Sermo* 167 [art. 33], *Sermo* 193 [art. 7], *Sermo* 195 [art. 7], *Sermo* 204 [art. 46], *Sermo* 210 [art. 8], *Sermo* 215 [art. 8], *Sermo* 64 *ad fratres in eremo* [art. 20]

Pseudo-Basil, *Admonitio ad filium spiritualem* (CPL 1155a) [art. 90]

Pseudo-Bede, *Expositio in primum librum Mosis* [art. 30?]

Pseudo-Bede, *Sermo* 70 [art. 64]

Pseudo-Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 17 [arts. 1, 30, 34]

Pseudo-Cyprian, *De duodecim abusivis saeculi* (CPL 1106) [art. 90]

Pseudo-Hildefonsus, *Sermo* 4 [art. 15]

Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 24 [art. 74], *Sermo* 78 [art. 75], *Sermo* 88 [art. 73]

Pseudo-Melito, *Vita s. Iohannis apostoli* (BHL 4320) [arts. 9, 10]

Sermons in Munich, BSB, clm 6233 (Tegernsee, s. viii^{ex}; CLA 9.1252) [arts. 11, 12, 14, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 50]

Sulpicius Severus, *Vita s. Martini* (BHL 5610; CPL 475) [art. 65]

Theodulf of Orléans, *Capitula* [arts. 18, 20, 21, 22, 23]

Transitus Mariae (W recension, BHL 5352b–n) [art. 49]

Vienna *Commentary on Luke* [arts. 12, 15]

Vienna *Commentary on Matthew* [art. 11]

Visio s. Pauli (BHL 6580–82) [art. 42]

Cross was right about most of these,[19] and by any reckoning this is an impressive group of texts that were available to a single author working in the ninth or early-tenth century, when the original collection was put together.[20] That a single author was responsible for at least the majority of the 96 sermons in Pembroke 25 is obvious from the numerous stylistic traits that recur throughout the collection,[21] and from the author's habit of employing the same passage

[19] I hasten to point out that Professor Cross made all of his remarkable source discoveries long before there were any online searchable databases of ancient and medieval texts such as we have today. He made those discoveries by reading widely in Latin and Old English and remembering what he had read and where he had read it.

[20] The date of the original collection is difficult to establish with certainty, but it must have been compiled after the date of its latest datable sources, which include Amalarius's *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (ca. 820 A.D.), Hrabanus's *De institutione clericorum* (819), and the sermon "Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis" (before ca. 835 A.D.; see below, p. 000). The collection must also have been compiled before it was transmitted to England and was consulted by the author of Tristram III and Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI, all composed in Canterbury between 959 and 988 A.D. See Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 89–90. Of course, it may be significant that no sources for the collection have been identified that post-date the 830s.

[21] For example, fourteen sermons (arts. 1 at fol. 3r/2, 5 at fol. 10v/19, 8 at fol. 15r/10, 23 at fol. 46r/2, 29 at fol. 63v/1, 40 at fol. 91r/18, 42 at fol. 95v/19, 45 at fol. 102r/19, 47 at fol. 108v/16, 53 at fol. 123v/15, 66 at fol. 137r/1, 92 at fol. 171v/4, 93 at fol. 173r/9, and 95 at fol. 177v/25) include the phrase *oportet nos* or *nos oportet* or simply *oportet* ("it behooves us") in their opening sentence. Four (arts. 1 at fol. 3r/2, 22 at fol. 43r/1, 30 at fol. 65v/4, and 48 at fol. 111v/21) use the phrase *primum omnium* ("first of all") in their opening sentence. Three (arts. 30 at fol. 65v/4, 48 at fol. 111v/21, and 51 at fol. 119v/17) open with the phrase *inquirendum est* ("it should be asked"). Some even combine these phrases by beginning with *primum omnium oportet nos* ("first of all it behooves us": art. 1 at fol. 3r/2) or *primum omnium inquirendum est* ("first of all it should be asked": arts. 30 at fol. 65v/4 and 48 at fol. 111v/21). Moreover, thirteen sermons quote a verse of Scripture and then offer a paraphrase or interpretation of it introduced by the phrase *ac si dixisset* ("but it is as if he had said"): art. 1, fol. 4r/7; art. 2, fol. 6r/14; art. 8, fol. 16v/8; art. 12, fol. 22r/11; art. 15, fol. 28v/7; art. 18, fol. 35v/10; art. 23, fol.

from the same source texts again and again from one sermon to the next, including the sermons that come *after* art. 77, which Barré believed to signal the end of the original collection. For instance, a passage on the Athanasian Creed from Caesarius's *Sermo* 3 is quoted in Pembroke 25, art. 1 and again in art. 24.[22] A passage from Pseudo-Caesarius, *Sermo* 17 on how the devil ruled the world before Christ's Advent is quoted and paraphrased in art. 1 and again in art. 30.[23] A lengthy passage from Book 7 of Isidore's *Etymologiae* that takes up almost the entirety of art. 54 is also quoted in art. 55.[24] A few lines from Chapter 3 of Alcuin's *De virtutibus et vitiis* are loosely quoted in arts. 20 and 91,[25] and a passage of more than eighty words from Chapter 4 of the same work is quoted nearly verbatim in both arts. 22

46v/9; art. 26, fol. 53r/12; art. 29, fol. 64r/15–16; art. 30, fol. 66r/5–6; art. 33, fol. 77r/13; art. 45, fol. 103r/1; art. 47, fol. 109v/3 and 109v/17. For additional clues that a single author composed many sermons in the collection, see Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 52–55.

[22] Compare art. 1, fol. 3r/5–10 ("Alia est enim persona Patris … et coaequales") with art. 24, fol. 48r/17–22 ("Alia est enim persona Patris … et coaequales"), both distilled from Caesarius, *Sermo* 3 (CCSL 103, p. 20, line 7 – p. 21, line 4).

[23] Compare art. 1, fol. 3v/6–13 ("Illud quoque scire … transgressus est mandatum Dei"), with art. 30, fol. 67v/8–13 ("Illud quoque scire … transgressus est mandatum Dei"), both adapted from the second sentence of Pseudo-Caesarius, *Sermo* 17 (PL 67:1079CD).

[24] Compare art. 54, fols. 125r/2–27r/23 ("Angeli grece uocantur … angeli non praesint") with art. 55, ed. J. E. Cross, "An Unpublished Story of Michael the Archangel and Its Connections," in *Magister Regis: Studies in Honor of Robert Earl Kaske*, ed. Art Groos with Emerson Brown, Jr., Giuseppe Mazzotta, Thomas D. Hill, and Joseph S. Wittig (New York, 1986), 34–35, lines 45–64 ("Angeli grece uocantur … angeli non praesint"), both based on Isidore, *Etymologiae* 7.5, ed W. M. Lindsay, *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, 2 vols., Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis (Oxford, 1911), pp. 274–77.

[25] Compare art. 20, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, p. 202, lines 35–39 ("Diliges Dominum Deum … sicut teipsum") with art. 91, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, p. 162, lines 3–5 ("Diliges Dominum Deum … tamquam teipsum"), both based on Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* 3 (PL 101:615).

and 91.[26] The Carolingian All Saints sermon beginning "Legimus in ecclesiasticiis historiis" is divided up and used in its entirety for eight sermons (or lections) from art. 56 to art. 63 and is also briefly quoted in art. 55.[27] A short chapter in praise of fasting from the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* is quoted in art. 22 and again in art. 37.[28] There is also a very unusual compositional feature that unites many of these sermons in that at least twelve quote antiphons or responses from the monastic night Office.[29] Cross counted thirty-six antiphons and responses within the collection; at least one more should be added to his tally since the very first sermon quotes the first response of the first Nocturn from the Office for the First Sunday in Advent, "Aspiciens a longe ecce uideo Dei potentiam uenientem et nebulam totam

[26] Compare art. 22, ed. Helen L. Spencer, "Vernacular and Latin Versions of a Sermon for Lent: 'A Lost Penitential Homily' Found," *MS* 44 (1982), 283, lines 1–8 ("tria quaedam unicuique homini pernecessaria … Deus in illo") with art. 91, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 162–63, lines 17–24 ("Tria ergo haec pernecessaria … Deus in illo"), both adapted from Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* 4 (PL 101:616). Discussion by Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 53–54.

[27] The passage in art. 55, fols. 128v/26–29r/19 ("Alii quidem ex his … peruenire mereamur") corresponds to the text edited by J. E. Cross, " 'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis': A Sermon for All Saints, and Its Use in Old English Prose," *Traditio* 33 (1977), 108–10, lines 44–60 ("Alii ex illis … peruenire ualeamus").

[28] Compare art. 22, ed. Spencer, "Vernacular and Latin Versions of a Sermon for Lent," p. 287, lines 59–64 ("dicit Isidorus: Ieiunium est res sancta … inluminat animam") with art. 37, fols. 87r/27–v/9 ("Isidorus explanat dicens: Ieiunium est res sancta … inluminat animam"), both excerpted from the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* 12.3, ed. Hermann Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1885; repr. Darmstadt, 1966), p. 34.

[29] Intriguingly, an eleventh- or twelfth-century hand has added a neumed response for the first Sunday in Lent adapted from Psalm 26:9, "Adiutor meus esto domine ne derelinquas me deus salutaris meus" (Hesbert, no. 6037) on a page of the Vercelli Book (fol. 24v) following the conclusion of Vercelli IV: see Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 461 (no. 394 art. 4); and Samantha Zacher, *Preaching the Converted: The Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Book Homilies*, TASS 1 (Toronto, 2009), pp. 21–22.

terram tegentem. Ite obuiam ei et dicite nuntia nobis si tu es ipse qui regnaturus es in populo Israel" (Hesbert, no. 6129), at fol. 5r/9–12. Not every sermon in the Saint-Père collection is an original composite sermon produced by our single mystery author. About thirty (arts. 3, 4, 6, 7, 16, 19, 32, 32a, 38, 39, 54, 56–64, 66, 67, 74–77, and 93–95) are based in large part on single texts that were already in existence, albeit often embellished with original beginnings and endings and numerous interpolations. But the majority do appear to be original compositions by a single individual, and if that is the case, then he was an individual who had access to what by ninth- or tenth-century standards was a formidable library.

What can we say about the nature of that library? For one thing, many of the texts included in it are standard works of Christian instruction or biblical exegesis that were widely available at the time: Amalarius's *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, Ambrose on Luke, Augustine on John, Bede on Acts, Cassiodorus on the Psalms, the Eusebius/Rufinus *Historia ecclesiastica*, Isidore's *Etymologiae*, Jerome on Matthew. All of these texts were in broad circulation in the ninth and tenth centuries and would have been regarded as requisite reading for anyone who considered himself learned in Christian literature.[30] Of the thirty or so sermons which the compiler had access to, most were standard reading texts for the monastic night Office transmitted in the two great homiliaries compiled in the eighth century by Alan of Farfa and Paul the Deacon.[31] As many as seventeen of these texts could have come to the compiler by

[30] These titles figure repeatedly in the inventories of ninth- and tenth-century libraries compiled by Gustav Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (Bonn, 1885), pp. 1–132; and Paul Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, 5 vols. (Munich, 1918–90). For general orientation on the contents of ninth-century Frankish libraries, see James Westfall Thompson, *The Medieval Library* (New York, 1957), pp. 54–101; and Rosamond McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 165–210.

[31] The contents of these two great homiliaries are reconstructed by Réginald Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux: Analyse de manuscrits*, Biblioteca degli "Studi Medievali" 12 (Spoleto, 1980), pp. 127–221 (for

way of the Homiliary of Alan of Farfa (AF):

AF 1.5 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 195 [art. 7]

AF 1.7 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 123 [art. 7]

AF 1.8 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 193 [art. 7]

AF 1.19 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 210 [art. 8]

AF 1.31 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 112 [art. 12]

AF 1.52 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 199 [art. 21]

AF 1.93 = Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* 120.1–5 [art. 32a]

AF 2.2 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 160 [art. 35]

AF 2.17 = Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 90 [art. 37]

AF 2.39 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 216 [arts. 2, 44]

AF 2.84 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 187 [art. 3]

AF 2.85 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 188 [art. 4]

AF 2.94 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 223 [art. 73]

AF 2.95 = Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 88 [art. 73]

AF 2.102 = Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 24 [art. 74]

AF 2.103 = Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 78 [art. 75]

AF 2.106 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 227 [art. 77]

Another ten could have come by way of an augmented version of the Homiliary of Paul the Deacon (PD):

Alan of Farfa, which is essentially a copy of the old Roman Homiliary used at St. Peter's throughout the seventh and eighth centuries with a new preface added by Alan of Farfa) and pp. 423–78 (for Paul the Deacon, a novel compilation commissioned by Charlemagne).

PD 1.24 = Gregory the Great, *Hom*. 8 *in Evang*. [art. 6]

PD 1.71 = Gregory the Great, *Hom*. 15 *in Evang*. [art. 17]

PD 2.17 = Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 90 [art. 37]

PD 2.28 = Gregory the Great, *Hom*. 29 *in Evang*. [art. 41]

PD 2.33 = Gregory the Great, *Hom*. 30 *in Evang*. [art. 43]

PD 2.106 = Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 78 [art. 75]

PD 2.122 = Gregory the Great, *Hom*. 12 *in Evang*. [art. 76]

PD 2.127 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 227 [art. 77]

PD add. = Helisachar (?), "Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis" [arts. 56–63]

PD add. = Pseudo-Bede, *Sermo* 70 [art. 64]

So once again a substantial number of the collection's sources are broadly representative of established reading practices throughout Frankish territories. Instead, what really stands out in this inventory of source texts is the rarer and more unusual items, and I propose to comment on a few of these before calling into question one of the sources Cross identified for a passage in art. 30.

One group of texts that one might not expect to find in the book cupboard of just any and every Carolingian ecclesiastical centre is the cluster of biblical apocrypha represented by four sermons in Pembroke 25 which are adaptations of the *Evangelium Pseudo-Matthaei*, the *Protevangelium Iacobi*, the *Transitus Mariae*, and a chapter on the death of the apostle John from the Pseudo-Abdias *Virtutes apostolorum*.[32] The sermon based on the *Protevangelium* is

[32] For detailed discussion of the transmission and reception of these and other apocryphal texts in Anglo-Saxon England, see *SASLC*: *The Apocrypha*; and Biggs, "An Introduction and Overview of Recent Work," in

the rarest of all. This is an abbreviated Latin version of the Greek *Protevangelium* adapted as a sermon for the feast of the Nativity of the Virgin which, aside from its inclusion in manuscripts of the Saint-Père Homiliary, is elsewhere attested in only three manuscripts.[33] All three of those manuscripts are of the twelfth century or later and, in Jean-Daniel Kaestli's judgement, all three depend ultimately on the Saint-Père collection for this item, so that the Saint-Père Homiliary appears to be responsible for the entire transmission history of this exceptionally rare Latin adaptation of a Greek apocryphon.[34] A fifth apocryphal text, the *Visio Pauli*, was claimed by Cross as a source for Pembroke 25, art. 42, an Ascension Day sermon,[35] but the passage in question merely recounts the tortures suffered by the damned in hell, a theme that appears in many sermons of the tenth and eleventh centuries, including Blickling XVI, Napier XL, Tristram III, Vercelli IX, and the Old English Rogationtide sermon known as Bazire-Cross IV, so these torments of hell need not be traced directly to the

---

Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England, ed. Kathryn Powell and Donald Scragg, MANCASS 2 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2003), pp. 1–25.

[33] This sermon (inc. "Inquirendum est, fratres karissimi, et explanandum per ordinem") survives in three manuscripts of the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres: Pembroke 25, fols. 119v–22r; St John's 42, fols. 50r–51v; and Balliol 240, fols. 107v–9r. The only three other known copies are in Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 537 (s. xii), fols. 31v–32v; Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, K 506 (s. xii/xiii), fols. 3r–5r; and Frankfurt, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Praed. 43 (Frankfurt, s. xv), fols. 121ra–vb.

[34] See Jean-Daniel Kaestli, "Le *Protévangile de Jacques* en latin: État de la question et perspectives nouvelles," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 26 (1996), 47–52; and Kaestli, "Le *Protévangile de Jacques* latin dans l'homélie *Inquirendum est* pour la fête de la Nativité de Marie," *Apocrypha* 12 (2001), 99–153, who edits and translates the sermon at pp. 122–35 from the six manuscripts identified in the previous note and who argues that the sermon was in fact composed by the author/compiler of the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres.

[35] See Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 34 and 192, lines 47–54.

Visio Pauli.[36] The *Visio Pauli* may well be the ultimate source for some details in this passage in art. 42, but it's not the immediate source.

Two other source texts are worth drawing attention to because of their exceptionally limited transmission history. First, art. 55 is a sermon for the feast of Saint Michael based on the *Apparitio sancti Michaelis archangeli* designated by the Bollandists as BHL 5956b. Apart from its occurrence in Pembroke 25 and two other manuscripts of the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres, BHL 5956b is known from only a single copy in a manuscript from the mid-twelfth century produced in Normandy at Caen, now Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 703B, fols.

[36] See *BH*, pp. 209, line 34 – 211, line 5; Tristram, pp. 167–68, lines 142–63; *VH*, pp. 170–72, lines 118–43; Napier, pp. 187, line 15 – 188, line 10; Bazire-Cross, p. 63, lines 40–75; and the important discussions by Wright, *The Irish Tradition* (as above, n. 8), pp. 106–74; and Stephen Pelle, "The Seven Pains of Hell: The Latin Source of an Old English Homiletic Motif," *RES* n.s. 62 (2011), 167–80. The passage in Pembroke 25 is just three sentences long but manages to conflate three originally separate conceits that recur frequently in medieval visions of hell: the notions that hell can be characterised through an *x sine y* rhetorical formula (e.g. *tristitia sine letitia*, "sorrow without joy"), that some sinners in hell are punished by hanging, and that other sinners in hell are punished by submersion at various levels in a river of fire. The hanging and submersion torments are indeed famously depicted in the *Visio Pauli*: see Theodore Silverstein, ed., *Visio Sancti Pauli: The History of the Apocalypse in Latin together with Nine Texts*, Studies and Documents (London, 1935), pp. 69–72; Theodore Silverstein and Anthony Hilhorst, eds., *Apocalypse of Paul: A New Critical Edition of Three Long Latin Versions*, Cahiers d'orientalisme 21 (Geneva, 1997), pp. 140–43 (§§ 35–36); Lenka Jirousková, *Die Visio Pauli: Wege und Wandlungen einer orientalischen Apoktyphe im Lateinischen Mittelalter. Unter Einschluß der alttschechischen und deutschsprachigen Textzeugen*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 34 (Leiden, 2006), pp. 312–13, 516–20, 569–77, and 704–18; Tomás O'Sullivan, "The Vision of Saint Paul: Redaction XI," in *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, ed. John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitrôna Ó Dochartaigh, 2 vols. (Aberystwyth, 2014), 1:406–7 (§5); and Rossana E. Guglielmetti, "Deux témoins inédits de la *Visio Pauli*," *Apocrypha* 26 (2015), 67–68 and 75. But the verbal parallels between the Pembroke 25 sermon and the *Visio Pauli* are insufficient to suggest an immediate debt from one to the other.

100v–101r.[37] On the basis of stylistic features which the Michael sermon has in common with other sermons in the Saint-Père Homiliary, Cross argued that the copy in the Vatican manuscript in fact derives from the Saint-Père Homiliary, where this very rare text may have originated.[38]

Second, art. 89 is a sermon addressed to preachers (*sancti praedicatores*) offering instruction on how to preach to the people. A passage from this sermon on the vanity of the world which claims to be citing from a *tractator sapiens* (a wise commentator) and a second passage from the same sermon on Christ as *redemptor*, *saluator*, and *susceptor* are both taken, as Cross pointed out, from a short thirteen-line text first printed by Cardinal Angelo Mai in 1852 under the name of "Dynamius Grammaticus," whom he identified as Dynamius Patricius († 601), a governor of Provence who was a friend and correspondent of Gregory the Great and evidently a man of some learning.[39] Cardinal Mai printed this text from a single

[37] See Cross, "An Unpublished Story" (as above, n. 24), who edits the sermon at pp. 33–35 from the four known manuscripts (Pembroke 25, fols. 127v–29r; St John's 42, fol. 53rv; Balliol 240, fols. 111r–12r; and Reg. lat. 703B, fols. 100v–101r). The Vatican text corresponds to exactly half of the Saint-Père sermon (lines 1–41 out of 82 lines total in Cross's edition).

[38] Cross, "An Unpublished Story," pp. 28–29.

[39] The letter (inc. "O quam dolenda condicio") was first printed by Angelo Mai, *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae* I (Rome, 1852), p. 182. It has since been edited by Bengt Löfstedt, "Grammatisch-rhetorische Fragmente im Anonymus ad Cuimnanum," *Eranos* 88 (1990), 121–24. The letter is also quoted wholesale in the seventh-century Hiberno-Latin grammatical treatise known as the *Expossitio Latinitas* by the Anonymus ad Cuimnanum, ed. Bernhard Bischoff and Bengt Löfstedt, CCSL 133D (Turnhout, 1992), p. 16, lines 510–29, so it is possible that the Pembroke 25 sermon is based not on the letter directly but on the Anonymus ad Cuimnanum. On Dynamius's career and œuvre, see CPL 1058; Dag Norberg, "Dyname Patrice de Marseilles," *JML* 1 (1991), 46–51; Collette Jeudy, "Fragments carolingiens de la grammaire de Dynamius (ms. Darmstadt 3303)," in *History of Linguistic Thought in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Vivian Law, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science: Series 3, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 71 (Amsterdam, 1993), pp. 127–

ninth-century manuscript from Lorsch (Vatican City, BAV, Pal. lat. 1746) as an [*Epistola*] *ad discipulum* prefacing the *Ars grammatica* also once associated with Dynamius Patricius, but both the grammar and its prefatory letter have since come under scrutiny by scholars who are doubtful of the attribution, some attributing the letter instead to another Dynamius, the fourth-century rhetorician Flavinius Dynamius of Bourdeaux. Leaving aside the question of authorship, which may remain unsettled for some time, this text, which is indisputably the ultimate source of these two passages in Pembroke 25 art. 89, is indeed a rarity. Copies are known in only three manuscripts,[40] although about half of the letter is also incorporated into the *Catechesis Celtica* in Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 49 (Brittany, s. ix/x), fol. 20r.[41] In view

44; Luigi Munzi, "Dinamio grammatico cristiano?," in *MOYΣA: Scritti in onore di Giuseppe Morelli*, Edizioni e saggi universitari di filologia classica: Fuori sezione 5 (Bologna, 1997), pp. 407–8; Walter Berschin, "Dinamius Patricius von Marseille († nach 597)," in Berschin, *Mittellateinische Studien* (Heidelberg, 2005), pp. 9–15; Bruno Dumézil, "Le patrice Dynamius et son réseau: culture aristocratique et transformation des pouvoirs autour de Lérins dans la seconde moitié du vi^{e} siècle," in *Lérins, une île sainte de l'antiquité au moyen âge*, ed. Yann Codou and Michel Lauwers, Collection d'études médiévales de Nice 9 (Turnhout, 2009), pp. 167–93; and Michael Lapidge, "Dynamius Patricius," in *Compendium Auctorum Latinorum Medii Aevi* (Florence, 2000–), 3:165.

[40] In addition to the copy in Pal. lat. 1746 published by Cardinal Mai, copies also survive in Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. Q. 69 (St Gall, s. viii/ix; CLA 10.1585), fol. 19v; and Zurich, Zentralbibliothek C 78 (St Gall, this part s. ix^{ex}), fols. 156v–57r.

[41] The text is printed by André Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia: Extraits des manuscrits latins de la reine Christine conservés au Vatican*, Studi e testi 59 (1933; repr. Vatican City, 1984), pp. 44–45 (III. Varia Excerpta (*1*.), lines 14–23, corresponding to lines 5–11 of Löfstedt's edition of Dynamius's letter). Reg. lat. 49 is dated "IX./X. Jh. (?)" by Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 6608. Thorough surveys of scholarship on the manuscript through the year 2007 are provided by Jean Rittmueller, ed., *Liber questionum in euangeliis*, CCSL 108F (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 67–79; and Donnchadh Ó Corráin, *Clavis Litterarum Hibernensium: Medieval Irish Books & Texts (c. 400–c. 1600)*, 3 vols., CCC (Turnhout, 2017), 1:225–27 (no. 192).

of the fact that at least four sermons in Pembroke 25 have close parallels in the *Catechesis Celtica*,[42] which survives in a single Breton manuscript, and that a fifth sermon hints at a Breton source,[43] it is tempting to wonder whether our author/compiler encountered a copy of Dynamius's letter in a manuscript from Brittany.

The source work undertaken by Cross in the 1980s established a solid foundation for the study of the Saint-Père Homiliary, but inevitably there are a few places where corrections and refinements are in order. Several such corrections and refinements were put forward a year after Cross's monograph appeared by François Dolbeau in his 1988 review of Cross's book.[44] Dolbeau pointed out that the passage in art. 1 (fols. 4r/20–4v/26) associating each of the Seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit with a particular patriarch or prophet (*sapientia* in Adam, *intellectus* in Noah, *consilium* in Abraham, etc.), cumulatively embodied in Christ, derives from an anonymous sermon of no later than the end of the eighth century entitled *De septiformis spiritus sancti*.[45] Moreover, the interpretation of the gifts of the Three Magi in art. 13 (fols. 24r/10–24v/1) is taken from an unpublished Pseudo-Gregorian Commentary on the

---

[42] See the comments in the Appendix below under arts. 5, 26, 27, and 29; and Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 20, 28–30, 63–64, and 66–68.

[43] See the comments in the Appendix below under art. 90.

[44] Dolbeau, "Du nouveau sur un sermonnaire de Cambridge" (as above, n. 1).

[45] This sermon (inc. "Flos de uirga ascendens," following a pericope of Isa. 11:1–3) is printed by Albert Dufourcq, *Étude sur les Gesta Martyrum romains. Vol. IV: Le Néo-Manichéisme et la légende chrétienne*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 83.4 (1910; repr. Paris, 1988), pp. 226–28, from Paris, BnF, lat. 2175 (?Weißenburg, this part s. viii/ix or ix$^{in.}$), fols. 94r–96v. A copy from Munich, BSB, clm 14311 (Germany, s. x), fols. 221r–22r is partially printed by Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 242–44. Six additional manuscripts are identified by Gorman, "The Carolingian Miscellany" (next note), p. 353. On the exegetical conceit of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, each present in an Old Testament patriarch, cumulatively embodied in Christ, see Bayless and Lapidge, eds., *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae* (as above, n. 8), pp. 170–73 (nos. 330–37) and 265–67.

Gospels. Art. 24 ends with a Doomsday scenario taken from Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo Caillau-Saint-Yves* 2.19. Arts. 33 and 42 both quote from Gennadius, *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*. And art. 88 concludes with a passage from Caesarius, *Sermo* 199, which is also quoted in art. 21. Most importantly, Dolbeau was able to show that some of these additional source texts did not come to the Saint-Père compiler piecemeal but through a single florilegium, two examples of which he identified in ninth-century manuscripts.[46] If the surviving witnesses to this florilegium are indeed reliable indicators of what the Saint-Père compiler had before him, then he had access to a manuscript containing Gennadius's *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*, a Gospel commentary attributed to Gregory the Great which is now commonly known as the Pseudo-Jerome *Expositio IV Evangeliorum*,[47] and the sermon *De septiformis spiritus sancti*, all of which have been identified as sources for sermons in the Saint-Père collection. But that ninth-century florilegium also contained several additional

[46] On the manuscripts and contents of this widely disseminated florilegium, see Michael Gorman, "The Carolingian Miscellany of Exegetical Texts in Albi 39 and Paris Lat. 2175," *Scriptorium* 51.2 (1997), 336–54, repr. in Gorman, *Biblical Commentaries from the Early Middle Ages*, Millennio Medievale 32, Reprints 4 (Sismel, 2002), pp. 476–94, who dates the collection to "about the year 800" (p. 337 [repr. p. 477]); and Wright, *The Irish Tradition* (as above, n. 8), pp. 71–72.

[47] On the Pseudo-Jerome *Expositio IV Evangeliorum* and its influence in early Britain and Ireland, see BCLL 341; CPL 631; CPPM II, 2296; RBMA 3428–3431; Bruno Griesser, "Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der *Expositio IV euangeliorum* des ps.-Hieronymus," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 54 (1930), 46–61; Griesser, "Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der Expositio IV Evangeliorum des ps. Hieronymus," *RB* 49 (1937), 279–321; Joseph F. Kelly, "A Catalogue of Early Medieval Hiberno-Latin Biblical Commentaries (II)," *Traditio* 45 (1989–90), 397–98 (no. 56A); Charles D. Wright, "Hiberno-Latin and Irish-Influenced Biblical Commentaries, Florilegia, and Homily Collections," in *SASLC*: *A Trial Version*, pp. 100–101; and Anne K. Kavanaugh, "The Ps.-Jerome *Expositio IV Evangeliorum,"* in *The Scriptures and Early Medieval Ireland: Proceedings of the 1993 Conference of the Society for Hiberno-Latin Studies on Early Irish Exegesis and Homiletics*, ed. Thomas O'Loughlin, Instrumenta Patristica 31 (Turnhout, 1999), pp. 124–31.

texts that have not yet been identified as sources for the collection, including Isidore's *Allegoriae*, an exposition lifted from Alcuin's *Epistola* 136 on the allegorical meanings of the word *gladius* (sword) among the evangelists, and a set of *Quaestiones de litteris uel singulis causis* which explicates passages from Genesis.[48] The Saint-Père compiler probably had these texts in his library, and further investigation into the sources of the collection may turn up parallels to them. These are prime candidates for additional sources of the collection.

Another place where Cross's claims about the sources of a particular sermon may now require rethinking is in art. 30, which is a sermon for Good Friday that begins by explaining the two-step process according to which God created all things. The opening paragraph of that sermon reads as follows from Pembroke 25, fols. 65v/3–14, retaining manuscript spelling and punctuation (and one error due to eyeskip):

> OMELIA IN PARASCEUEN DE PASSIONE DOMINI · HOC PRIMUM omnium inquirendum est · humano generi · qualiter mundus a principio creatus et formatus est ab omnipotenti omnium conditore deo · et quomodo in peccato postea lapsus est · Et iterum per dei misericordiam redemptus et restauratus est · *Duas* igitur *res ante omnem diem et ante omne tempus condidit deus · Angelicam uidelicet creaturam et informem materiam ·* ***quę quidem ex nichilo facta processit*** *· qui* autem *uiuit in aeternum ·* secundum materiae substantiam · *creauit omnia semel ·* secundum distinctionem uero specierum pro sex dierum alternationem formata sunt.. In eo autem quod dicit creauit nihil non simul factum in omnibus creaturis reliquit · *non omnia* uero *ex nihilo condidit deus · sed quedam fecit ex nihilo · quedam ex aliquo ·* Ex

[48] The latter text is now edited by Nicholas Everett, "The *Interrogationes de littera et de singulis causi*s: An Early Medieval School Text," *JML* 16 (2006), 227–75.

nihilo · angelos et informem materiam *et animas ex aliquo · hominem et cęteras mundi creaturas ·*[49]

This account of the process of creation, occurring simultaneously but in two sequential stages, can be traced back to Augustine, who explains in his *Confessiones* and in his *De Genesi ad litteram* that God created everything all at once in a single act, but that single act involved two separate steps: step one consisting of the creation of angels and formless matter out of nothing, and step two consisting of the creation of everything else from the formless matter that had just been created.[50] In Augustine's terms, the angels and formless matter have

[49] "A homily for Good Friday on the Lord's Passion. It should first of all be asked by the human race how the world was created and formed from the beginning by God, the omnipotent creator of all things, and how it afterwards fell into sin and was once again redeemed and restored through God's mercy. So it was that before any day, and before all time, God created two things: namely angelic beings and formless matter, which indeed came into being made from nothing. Moreover, he who lives in eternity created all things at once according to the substance of matter. He left nothing in that same instant unmade in all creatures. God did not create all things out of nothing, but some things he made out of nothing, some things out of something. Out of nothing [he created] angels and formless matter and souls; out of something [he created] man and other creatures of the earth."

[50] For a succinct account of Augustine's theory of creation, see S. Knuuttila, "Time and Creation in Augustine," in *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, ed. E. Stump and N. Kretzmann, Cambridge Companions to Philosophy (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 103–15. The idea that God created all things at once in eternity is rooted in Eccles. 18:1: "qui vivit in aeternum creavit omnia simul," a verse quoted in the passages below from the Pseudo-Bede commentary and Isidore's *De differentiis rerum*. This doctrine of instantaneous creation was taught at Canterbury by Archbishop Theodore and Abbot Hadrian: Bernhard Bischoff and Michael Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*, CSASE 10 (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 308–9 and 439. Other witnesses to this idea are discussed by Marina Smyth, *Understanding the Universe in Seventh-Century Ireland*, Studies in Celtic History 15 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1996), pp. 38–39. On the influence of

priority in origin but not in time since time did not yet exist and God created everything in eternity. This subtle but logical formulation of the process of creation was repeated and revised by many later writers, and Professor Cross thought that the author of Pembroke 25, art. 30, was basing his version of the story on the Pseudo-Bede Commentary on Genesis in PL 91, which falls within this Augustinian tradition and does indeed parallel many of the details in the Pembroke 25 sermon.[51] I suspect, however, that the sermon writer was not reading this Pseudo-Bede commentary, but instead was relying on another text based on the creation story in Isidore's *De differentiis rerum*, which is in fact the main source for this part of the Pseudo-Bede commentary. In the two passages printed below, the italicized phrases from Isidore in passage 2 are in agreement with the italicized phrases from the Pembroke 25 sermon just printed above. The italicized phrases from the Pseudo-Bede commentary in passage 1 below are in agreement with Isidore but not necessarily with the Pembroke 25 sermon. The phrases in bold face in the Pembroke 25 sermon above and Isidore below occur only in these two texts and are sufficient indication that the sermon writer was not relying on the Pseudo-Bede commentary.

1. Pseudo-Bede, *Comm. in Genesim*:

Augustine's creation theory on Bede (who had very different views), see Conor O'Brien, "Bede on Creation," *RB* 123 (2013), 255–73.

[51] The Pseudo-Bede Commentary on Genesis (PL 91:189–286) is indexed by Machielsen, CPPM IIA, 2027; Stegmüller, RBMA 1647; and Ó Corráin, *Clavis Litterarum Hibernensium*, 1:96 (no. 41). The only two manuscripts of this work identified by Michael M. Gorman, "The Encyclopedic Commentary on Genesis Prepared for Charlemagne by Wigbod," *RA* 17 (1982), 178, n. 27, repr. in Gorman, *Biblical Commentaries from the Early Middle Ages*, p. 6, are Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 9327–8 (written near Paris, s. ix[1]), fols. 17r–132r; and Monte Cassino, Archivio 30 (s. x/xi), pp. 347–411.

Quod ergo dictum est, In principio creavit deus caelum et terram, materiam totius creaturae ostendit, rationalis et corporalis, id est, angelorum et hujus mundi. Vtrumque igitur fecit deus, id est materiam et formam, sicut uox et uerbum simul fit, quamuis uox prior sit origine. Denique scriptura ait, "Qui fecisti mundum de materia informi." *Sed materia facta est de nihilo, mundi* enim *species de informi materia*. *Proinde duas res ante omnem diem et ante omne tempus condidit deus, angelicam uidelicet creaturam et informem materiam*. Quamuis enim omnia simul facta sunt. *Qui* enim, inquit Salomon, *uiuit in aeternum, creauit omnia simul*. Sed tantum, ut praediximus, origine materia informis formatam speciem, sicut uox uerbum antecedit. *Itaque non omnia ex nihilo* fecit *deus, sed quaedam ex nihilo, quaedam* ex *aliquo condidit deus*. *De nihilo mundum* et *angelos et animam*, *ex aliquo hominem* et pecora *et ceteras creaturas*.[52]

2. Isidore, *De differentiis rerum* 2.11.30–31 (CCSL 111A, 22–23):

[52] Pseudo-Bede, *Comm. in Genesim*, ed. Michael Gorman, "The Commentary on the Pentateuch Attributed to Bede in PL 91:189–394," *RB* 106 (1996), 61–108 and 255–307, at 267, repr. in Gorman, *Biblical Commentaries from the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 63–163, at 123. "For thus it is said: In the beginning God created heaven and earth. He revealed the matter of every creature, rational and corporal, that is, of angels and of this world. And so God made both, that is matter and form, much as the voice and the word occur at the same time, even though the voice is prior in origin. Scripture thus says: *Who hast made the world from unformed matter* (Wisdom 11:18 VL). But matter is made from nothing; however, the substance of the earth [is made] from unformed matter. Consequently, before any day and before all time, God created two things, namely angelic creatures and formless matter, even though all things were created at once. For *He who*, Solomon says, *lives in eternity created all things at once* (Eccles. 18:1), but as we have said, only unformed matter preceded formed substance in origin, just as the voice precedes the word. Thus God did not make all things from nothing, but God created some things out of nothing, and some things out of something. From nothing [he created] the world and angels and the soul; out of something [he created] man and cattle and other creatures."

> Sed materia facta est de nihilo. Mundi autem species de informi materia. Proinde *duas res ante omnem diem et ante omne tempus condidit Deus: angelicam, videlicet, creaturam, et informem materiam;* ***quae quidem ex nihilo facta, praecessit*** tamen res ex se factas non aeternitate, sed sola origine, sicut sonus cantum. Nam *qui vivit in aeternum, creavit omnia simul*. Itaque *non omnia ex nihilo condidit Deus, sed quaedam fecit ex nihilo, quaedam ex aliquo*. De *nihilo* mundum, *angelos et animam; ex aliquo hominem et ceteras mundi creaturas*.[53]

What complicates this situation is the fact that this passage from Isidore which lies behind both the Pembroke 25 sermon and the Pseudo-Bede commentary is quoted or paraphrased by the authors of several other Genesis commentaries, including a number of commentaries of the seventh and eighth centuries that might have been available to the Saint-Père compiler, since this passage from Isidore was frequently recycled and exists in a number of permutations.[54] In the four passages that follow, I offer representative parallels from the seventh-century *Liber de ordine creaturarum*, a Genesis commentary written in seventh-century Visigothic Spain, the eighth-century *Irish Reference Bible*, and an unpublished

---

[53] "But matter is made out of nothing; however, the substance of the world [is made] out of formless matter. Accordingly, before there was any day or time, omnipotent God created two things: namely angelic creatures and formless matter. Indeed whereas it [formless matter] was made out of nothing, it nevertheless preceded things made from it not in eternity, but only in its inception, just as a sound [precedes] song. For *he who lives in eternity created all things at once* (Eccles. 18:1). Thus God did not create all things out of nothing, but some things out of something, and some things out of nothing. From nothing [he created] the world, angels, and souls; out of something [he created] man and other creatures of the earth."

[54] Bede also quotes from this chapter of *De differentiis rerum* in his *Explanatio Apocalypsis* 3.19 (PL 93:189C: "quia nihil in substantia naturae eius visibile vel corporeum est, vel quia per eum omnia condidit"). See R. C. Love, "The Sources of Bede's *Explanatio Apocalypsis* (Reference L.F.2.16)," *Fontes* (2000).

Commentary on the Creation and Fall in St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 908 (from a portion of the manuscript dated to the eighth century), all of which recognizably rely on this passage from Isidore on the creation of the angels and unformed matter out of nothing:

3. *Liber de ordine creaturarum*15.8:

   Ex his autem omnibus creaturis, quorum praestrinximus ordinem, quaedam ex aliquo, quaedam ex nihilo conditor fecit. Caelum enim et terram et mare et quae in his sunt facta ex informi materia condidit; ipsam uero informem materiam et angelorum ordines de quibus praediximus et animam humanam ex nihilo fecit.[55]

4. Visigothic Commentary on Genesis:

   Proinde igitur duas res ante omnem diem et ante omne tempus condidit deus, id est, angelicam creaturam et informem materiam, id est, quasi caelum et terram.[56]

---

[55] *Liber de ordine creaturarum* 15.8, ed. Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz, *Liber de ordine creaturarum: un anónimo irlandés del siglo VII* (Santiago de Compostela, 1972), p. 200; trans. by Marina Smyth, "The Seventh-Century Hiberno-Latin Treatise *Liber de ordine creaturarum*. A Translation," *JML* 21 (2011), 207: "Of all those creatures whose nature we have discussed, God created some from something and some from nothing. For it was from unformed matter that he created heaven and earth and the sea and all that was made in them; but this very unformed matter, and the angelic orders of which we have spoken, and the human soul, these he made from nothing" (a revision of her earlier translation in *Understanding the Universe*, p. 42).

[56] Michael Gorman, "The Visigothic Commentary on Genesis in Autun 27 (S. 29)," *ÉA* 30 (1997), 242, repr. in Gorman, *Biblical Commentaries from the Early Middle Ages*, p. 398. "Accordingly, before any day and before all time, God created two things: namely angelic creatures and formless matter, that is, just as heaven and earth."

5. *The Irish Reference Bible*:

Item, ante omnem creaturam creati sunt angeli, et ante angeli, diabulus. Item, ante omnem diem et ante omnem tempus, tres res condidit deus ex nihilo: primum, informis materia; secundo, angeli; tertio, anima Ade.[57]

6. Commentary on the Creation and Fall in St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 908, p. 3:

Inde in libro Differentiarum Ysidorus clarissimae haec declarat dicens: Ante omnem diem et ante omne tempus duas res condedit deus, angelicam uidelicet creaturam et informem materiam.[58]

---

[57] *Reference Bible* §98, ed. Gerard MacGinty, *The Reference Bible/Das Bibelwerk. Inter Pauca Problesmata de Enigmatibus ex Tomis Canonicis*, CCSM 173 (Turnhout, 2000), p. 43; Ó Corráin, *Clavis Litterarum Hibernensium,* 1:129–31 (no. 101). "Also, the angels were created before any creature; and before the angels, the devil [was created]. Also, before any day and before all time, God created three things out of nothing: first, unformed matter; second, the angels; third, the soul of Adam." For other examples of the enumerative motif of the *tres res* created by God, see McNally, *Der irische Liber de numeris* (as above, n. 8), pp. 52–53.

[58] "On this point, Isidore most clearly confirms these things in his *Book of Distinctions*, saying: Before any day and before all time God created two things: namely angelic beings and unformed matter." I thank Charles D. Wright for bringing this passage to my attention. On the manuscript, see CLA 7.953; BCLL 1260; RBMA 11054; Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 5872; Charles D. Wright, "Apocryphal Lore and Insular Tradition in St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 908," in *Irland und die Christenheit: Bibelstudien und Mission/Ireland and Christendom: The Bible and the Missions*, ed. Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter, Veröffentlichungen des Europa Zentrums Tübingen, Kulturwissenschaftliche Reihe (Stuttgart, 1987), pp. 124–45; and Ó Corráin, CLH*,* 1:489 (no. 381). Other examples of the *duae creaturae* created by God are identified and discussed by D. Javier Soage Otero, "La tradición anónima de textos edificantes en el alto medioevo latino: Identificación y estudio de un corpus, con ediciones y transcripciones comentadas" (PhD thesis, Universidad de Salamanca, 2017), pp. 279–82.

The commentary in St Gall 908 even identifies Isidore by name as the progenitor of this idea. The point is, the Pseudo-Bede Commentary on Genesis is just one of several commentaries of the seventh and eighth centuries that look to Isidore for this information. The Pseudo-Bede text was not the immediate source of Pembroke 25, art. 30, but something quite close to it was, in all probability yet another commentary or sermon on the opening chapters of Genesis that was likewise based on Isidore but is now lost or unidentified. The seventh and eighth centuries spawned a virtual industry of Genesis commentaries, especially in England, Ireland, and centres on the Continent under Insular influence, and many of these Genesis commentaries were indebted to Isidore's *De differentiis rerum* for its account of creation.[59]

For a separate tradition, best represented in early Irish sources, that at Creation God first formed four things out of nothing (heaven, earth, angels, and the human soul), see Charles D. Wright, "*De plasmatione Adam*," in *The Embroidered Bible: Studies in Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Honour of Michael E. Stone*, ed. Lorenzo DiTommaso, Matthias Henze, and William Adler, Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 26 (Leiden, 2018), pp. 993–94. And for yet another tradition, represented by Alcuin, Ælfric, and the thirteenth-century Worcester Fragments, which held that God initially created seven things *ex nihilo* (heaven, earth, angels, light, air, water, and the human soul), see Stephen Pelle, "An Ælfrician Source for a Passage in the Worcester Fragments," *N&Q* n.s. 63 (2016), 188–89; and for a slight variant (formless matter, angels, light, the upper heavens, the earth, water, and air), see Bayless and Lapidge, *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*, pp. 150–51 (no. 238).

[59] In addition to the Genesis commentaries just mentioned, several others produced in the seventh and eighth centuries are identified and discussed by CPL 1344 (Bede's *Hexaemeron*); Bernhard Bischoff, "Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter," *SE* 6 (1954), 189–279, repr. with revisions in his *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart, 1966–81), 1:231–37 (nos. 1–4); Joseph F. Kelly, "A Catalogue of Early Medieval Hiberno-Latin Biblical Commentaries (I)," *Traditio* 44 (1988), 552–58 (nos. 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24A); Bernhard Bischoff and Michael Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*, CSASE 10 (Cambridge, 1994), esp. pp. 298–341 and 386–91; Michael Gorman, "A Critique of Bischoff's Theory of Irish

Another such commentary in the same general tradition as the Pseudo-Bede text and the St Gall 908 commentary might explain this passage in the Pembroke 25 sermon and would help underscore the challenges one faces in tracking down the sources of the Saint-Père collection.

This is just one minor adjustment to the picture that J. E. Cross painted in great detail of the background of this collection, and it illustrates his own conviction that source study is an ongoing process, refined and augmented and modified as scholars keep digging into the material and exploring textual relationships. Future study of the collection will no doubt adjust the picture I have just painted even further, and that future study will soon be facilitated by the complete online facsimile and transcription of all the Pembroke 25 homilies to be housed on the website of ECHOE, a project funded by the European Research Council and organised by Professor Winfried Rudolf. The online Pembroke 25 project has gone through several stages over the past few years with the assistance of many scholars, chief among whom is Professor Paul Szarmach, who deserves the credit for the idea in the first place. I am therefore pleased to dedicate this essay to his inspiration and his life-long fascination with the study of Old English anonymous homilies and their sources.

L2 Appendix:

L2 The Contents of Cambridge, Pembroke College 25

Exegesis: The Commentary on Genesis in Munich Clm 6302 (Wendepunkte 2)," *JML* 7 (1997), 178–233; Charles D. Wright, "Bischoff's Theory of Irish Exegesis and the Genesis Commentary in Munich clm 6302: A Critique of a Critique," *JML* 12 (2000), 115–75; and D. Ó Cróinín, "A New Seventh-Century Irish Commentary on Genesis," *SE* 40 (2001), 231–65. On the scarcity (in fact almost total absence) of original exegetical literature produced in Italy or the Frankish kingdoms during this period, as compared to the relative efflorescence of Insular and Insular-influenced exegesis, see Dáibhí Ó Cróinín, "Bischoff's Wendepunkte Fifty Years On," *RB* 110 (2000), 223–25; and I. N. Wood, "The Irish in England and on the Continent in the Seventh Century: Part II," *Peritia* 27 (2016), 206.

The contents of the Pembroke 25 Homiliary have been described in varying degrees of detail by Heinrich Schenkl, *Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Britannica*, no. 2527; M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Pembroke College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1905), pp. 25–29; Gneuss/Lapidge, no. 131; and most fully by James E. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25: A Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, KCLMS 1 (London, 1987), who provides a detailed inventory of contents, sermon by sermon, with summaries of important themes and motifs and identifications of some immediate and ultimate sources at pp. 19–43. The list of contents below gives the incipit and explicit of each sermon along with summaries of the known sources and references to published editions and relevant scholarship where such exists. Several of these sermons are based in part on ancient and well-known texts that were transmitted wholesale through the old Roman Homiliary that passed under the name of Alan of Farfa (AF) and its medieval derivatives; the full contents of the original collection have been reconstructed by Réginald Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux: Analyse de manuscrits*, Biblioteca degli "Studi Medievali" 12 (Spoleto, 1980), pp. 127–221. A few derive from sermons that circulated in versions of the eighth-century homiliary of Paul the Deacon (PD), the full contents of which have been reconstructed by Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux*, pp. 423–78. Seven sermons itemized below are included in the census of medieval sermons that circulated falsely under the names of patristic authors compiled by J. Machielsen, *Clavis Patristica Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi*, 1A–B: *Homiletica* (Turnhout, 1990) (CPPM I). Many of the remaining sermons in the manuscript are rare and unpublished. Portions of at least 20 were translated into Old English. The numbering of the sermons here follows Cross.

1. 3r–5v. Incipit omelia in quarta dominica ante natale Domini. Primum omnium oportet nos memorari, fratres karissimi, et recitare de Deo ueraciter et loqui caeli ac terrae

conditore … / … hoc studeat accipere, prestante eodem nostro Saluatore, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in aeternum sine fine per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the First Sunday in Advent, with borrowings from Pseudo-Caesarius, *Sermo* 17 (PL 67:1079–81) and an anonymous sermon *De septiformis spiritus sancti,* ed. Albert Dufourcq, *Étude sur les Gesta Martyrum romains. Vol. IV: Le Néo-Manichéisme et la légende chrétienne*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 83.4 (1910; repr. Paris, 1988), 4:226–28.

2. 5v–7v. .ii. Omelia in .iii. dominica ante natale Domini. Factum est autem cum impleta essent omnia quę de aduentu Domini in carne temporibus praedicta per prophetas fuerant … / … ad percipiendum sacrosanctum corpus et sanguinem Christi poteris accedere et in futuro seculo ad aeternam beatitudinem feliciter peruenire. Ipso adiuuante qui uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Second Sunday in Advent, mainly a narrative from the Gospel of Luke 1:26–48, with borrowings from Caesarius, *Sermo* 216.3 (CCSL 104, p. 860); Caesarius, *Sermo* 187.3–4 (CCSL 104, pp. 764–65); and Caesarius, *Sermo* 188.6 (CCSL 104, pp. 769–70).

3. 7v–9r. .iii. In .ii[a]. dominica ante natale Domini. Illud scire et in corde frequenter meditari, et animo uoluntarie recordari debemus, fratres karissimi, quod iam prope est dies aduentus Domini … / … ad premia in caelestia regna mereantur, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, cui est honor et imperium et gloria in saecula sęculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Third Sunday in Advent adapted from Caesarius, *Sermo* 187 (CCSL 104, pp. 763–66; AF 2.84).

4. 9r–10v. .iiii. Omelia in prima ante natale Domini. Sanctam et gloriosam solemnitatem natuitatis Domini nostri Iesu Christi, Saluatoris cosmi, fideli deuotione, fratres karissimi, caelebraturi, totis uiribus nos debemus cum Dei adiutorio pręparare … / … supra multa te constituam; intra in gaudium Domini tui. Haec nobis prestare dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in saecula sęculorum. Amen.

   A sermon for the Fourth Sunday in Advent adapted from Caesarius, *Sermo* 188.1–5 (CCSL 104, pp. 767–69; AF 2.85).

5. 10v–11v. .v. Omelia in natale Domini nostri Iesu Christi. Oportet nos, fratres karissimi, gaudere hodie et exultare et in unum conuenire … / … ut ciues simus sanctorum in cęlis, prestante eodem Domino nostro Iesu Christo, cui est honor et imperium et potestas una cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

   A sermon for Christmas, ed. Joseph Lemarié, "Le sermon *Oportet nos, fratres karissimi, gaudere hodie et exultare* de l'homéliaire carolingien dit 'de Saint-Père de Chartres,'" in *Florentissima proles ecclesiae: Miscellanea hagiographica, historica et liturgica Reginaldo Grégoire OSB XII lustra complementi oblata*, ed. Domenico Gobbi (Trent, 1996), pp. 373–79. Machielsen, CPPM I, 2315, 5323, identifies two other copies in Paris, BnF, lat. 2025 (s. xii), fols. 132v–33r; and Melk, Stiftsbibliothek 218 (s. xii vel xv [*sic!*]), fol. 78rv. An abbreviated recension is identified by Raymond Étaix, "Le grand lectionnaire de Corbie," in his *Homéliaires patristiques latins: Recueil d'études de manuscrits médiévaux*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Moyen-Âge et Temps modernes 29 (Paris, 1994), p. 210, in Paris, BnF, lat. 11702 (Corbie, s. xii), fol. 3r; and Lemarié (p. 374) points out that two other copies of this abbreviated recension appear in Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 470 (s. xii), fols. 42v–43r; and Worcester, Cathedral Library, F. 92 (Worcester, s. xi^{2}), fol. 60r–v. The portents at Christ's birth in

this sermon are discussed by Thomas N. Hall, "The Portents at Christ's Birth in Vercelli Homilies V and VI: Some Analogues from Medieval Sermons and Biblical Commentaries," in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, TASS 4 (Toronto, 2009), pp. 62–97, esp. at 84–86, who conjectures that "a ninth-century precursor" to this sermon "based on the *Catechesis Celtica* and transmitted via a version of the Saint-Père collection lies directly in the background of both Vercelli V and VI and the Old Icelandic Christmas sermon" (p. 96).

6. 11v–13v. Item alia. In illo tempore, *exiit edictum … bone uoluntatis* (Luke 2:1–14). Quia, largiente Domino, missarum sollemnitatem hodie caelebraturi sumus … / … Filius dignatus est agere ut humanum genus liberaret a peccato et secum duceret ad cęlestia regna, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

   Gregory the Great, *Hom.* 8 *in Evang.*, recension β (CCSL 141, pp. 53–56; PD 1.24), with a single added sentence at the end.

7. 13v–15r. .vii. Item alia. Venerandus est hic dies, fratres karissimi, ab omnibus fidelibus, in quo natiuitas Domini nostri Iesu Christi totum mundum noua ac preclara aduentus sui luce resplenduit … / … ut consortes fieri mereamur gaudiorum cęlestium cum eis, prestante eodem Saluatore nostro, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

   A sermon for Christmas adapted from Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 123 (PL 39:1990–91; AF 1.7), with echoes of several antiphons and responses (Hesbert, nos. 3093, 4091, 6858, 7068, and 7569).

8. 15r–16v. .viii. Omelia in natale sancti Stephani. Oportet nos disputare, fratres karissimi, de sancto Stephano primo apostolorum diacono. Septem enim ab ipsis ad diaconatus

officium electi sunt … / … Quam rem orantibus nobis et sancto Stephano, prestare dignetur Saluator mundi cunctis gentibus, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the feast of Saint Stephen (26 December) with borrowings from Caesarius, *Sermo* 219 (CCSL 104, pp. 867–70; PD 1.28) and Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 215.1–3 (PL 39:2145–46).

9. 16v–18r. .viiii. Omelia in natale sancti Iohannis euangelistae. Sanctum Iohannem adoptiuum Domini filium uenerari oportet, fratres karissimi, cui supra pectus eiusdem Domini recubanti reuelata sunt secreta cęlestia … / … et postea infinita turba credentium adhesit apostolo, prestante eodem Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Nativity of Saint John the Evangelist (27 December) adapted from the Pseudo-Melito *Vita sancti Iohannis apostoli* (PG 5:1241–43; BHL 4320), quoting one antiphon (Hesbert, no. 3425).

10. 18r–19v. .x. Item alia. Factum est, fratres karissimi, cum implesset Iohannes haec et multa his similia, et cum annorum esset nonaginta .vii., apparuit ei Dominus Iesus Christus cum discipulis suis … / … infirmitatibus suis uirtute precum et orationum eius. Largiente Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui coronis aureis clarificat sanctos suos. Cui est honor et imperium et potestas cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Nativity of Saint John the Evangelist (27 December) adapted from the Pseudo-Melito *Vita sancti Iohannis apostoli* (as above, art. 9) and the Pseudo-Abdias *Virtutes apostolorum* (BHL 4316), ed. J. A. Fabricius, *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, 2nd ed., 3 vols. in 2 (Hamburg, 1719), 2:582–89.

11. 19v–21r. .xi. Omelia in natale Innocentum. Glorificare oportet et honorare hanc solemnitatem beatorum ac felicium infantium, fratres karissimi, quorum hodie triumphalem passionis gloriam caelebramus … / … in numero sanctorum consortes esse mereamur in regnis caelestibus. Largiente Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the feast of Holy Innocents (28 December), edited and discussed by J. E. Cross, "The Insular Connections of a Sermon for Holy Innocents," in *Medieval Literature and Antiquities: Studies in Honour of Basil Cottle*, ed. Myra Stokes and T. L. Burton (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 57–70, who identifies parallels for several details in an unpublished Hiberno-Latin Commentary on Matthew in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Lat. 940 (Salzburg, s. ix^{in}), fols. 13r–141v; in the Commentary on Matthew in Orléans, BM 65 (Northeast Francia, s. ix^{med}), fols. 1–269, now known as the *Liber questionum in evangeliis*, ed. Jean Rittmueller, CCSL 108F (Turnhout, 2003); and in the *Evangelium Pseudo-Matthaei* 23–24, ed. Constantin von Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1876), pp. 86–88. Cross also identifies extensive verbal parallels with a long passage in an unpublished sermon in Munich, BSB, clm 6233 (Tegernsee, s. viii^{ex}; CLA 9.1252), fols. 121v–25r.

12. 21r–23r. .xii. Omelia in circumcisione Domini. Intelligendum est, fratres karissimi, et exponendum omnibus Noui Testamenti fidelibus, quod post consummationem octo dierum … / … Ubi bona inuisibilia quae preparauit Deus his qui diligunt eum possidebimus, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum eodem Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the feast of the Circumcision (1 January) with echoes of the Hiberno-Latin Vienna *Commentary on Luke* (CCSL 108C, pp. 16–17) and Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 112 (PL Suppl. 2:1213–16; AF 1.31).

13. 23r–24v. .xiii. Omelia in die Theophaniae. Predicanda sunt et recolenda miracula, fratres karissimi, et uirtutes, quę huius solemnitate dies peracta sunt … / … Hoc siquidem ordine feliciter possumus ad aeternam beatitudinem peruenire, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Epiphany (6 January), with borrowing from Caesarius, *Sermo* 194.4–5 (CCSL 104, p. 788) and with close parallels in a sermon in Munich, clm 6233 (as above, art. 11), fols. 131r–v, within a discussion of the gifts of the Magi.

14. 24v–27r. .xiiii. Item alia. Haec sunt mirabilia, fratres karissimi, quę in die solemnitatis sui baptismatis Dominus noster Iesus Christus ostendere dignatus est /25r/ et facere … / … in regno Patris nostri semper laudem dicentes Deo Patri et Iesu Christo in unitate Spiritus sancti per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Epiphany (6 January), with borrowing from Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 136 (PL 39:2013–15); close parallels with a sermon in Munich, clm 6233 (as above, art. 11), fols. 131v–32r and 133v–35v; and echoes of several antiphons (Hesbert, nos. 1552, 1553, 1554, 1768, 1788, 3678, and 5062).

15. 27r–28v. .xv. Omelia in purificatione sanctae Marię. Conueniendum est in unum nobis, fratres karissimi, ad huius diei sollempnitatem, quia hodie Christus cum substantia nostrę carnis in templo est dignatus presentari … / … exemplis bonę uitae ostendit Iesus Christus unigenitus eiusdem Dei Patris, qui eum eo semper uiuit dominatur et regnat Deus per omnia saecula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Purification of the Virgin Mary (2 February), with borrowings from Pseudo-Hildefonsus, *Sermo* 4 (PL 96:258); Ambrose, *Expositio secundum Lucam* 2.58 (CCSL 14, 56); the Hiberno-Latin Vienna *Commentary on Luke* (CCSL 108C, pp. 17–19); and three antiphons (Hesbert, nos. 2925, 3078, and 6759). A copy appears in the Worcester recension of the "Cotton-Corpus Legendary," London, BL, Cotton Nero E. i, pt. 1 (Worcester, this part s. xi$^{3/4}$), fols. 143r–44r.

16. 28v–31v. .xvi. Omelia in Septuagesima. /29r/ Inquirendum est, fratres karissimi, et subtiliter discutiendo inuestigandum quid mysterii continetur in officiis, quae scripta sunt in antiphonario et misali libello … / … et inuenietis requiem animabus uestris. /31v/ Haec nobis prestare dignetur idem Saluator, cui est honor et imperium et potestas una cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Septuagesima (the Ninth Sunday before Easter) adapted from Amalarius, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* 1.1 (PL 105:993–97).

17. 31v–33v. .xvii. Omelia in Sexagesima. Primum in prędicatione christianus debet populus silentium tenere … / … Ut cum iustis et misericordibus consortes esse in regno Dei ualeatis. prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Sexagesima (the Second Sunday before Ash Wednesday) based in part on Gregory the Great, *Hom*. 15 *in Evang*. 1–4 (CCSL 141, pp. 103–7; PD 1.71).

18. 33v–36r. .xx. Omelia in Quinquagesima. Hoc denuntiare uobis oportet, fratres karissimi, et uos diligentius considerare debetis … / … per opera iustitię ac misericordię aeterna nobis premia apud Deum preparamus, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, cui est honor et potestas et imperium et gloria in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Quinquagesima (the Sunday before Ash Wednesday), based largely on Caesarius, *Sermo* 57.1–2 (CCSL 103, pp. 251–52); Caesarius, *Sermo* 197 (CCSL 104, pp. 794–98); and Theodulf of Orleans, *Capitula* 36 (PL 105:203).

19. 36r–38r. .xviiii. Omelia in caput ieiunii. Pręcauendum est omnibus bona opera exercentibus, fratres karissimi, quod Dominus dicit in aeuangelio: *Adtendite, ne iustitiam uestram faciatis coram hominibus* (Matt. 6:1) … / … non pro uanitate uel cupiditate huius mundi, sed pro Dei amore et desiderio aeternę beatitudinis faciamus. Quod nobis prestare dignetur Iesus Christus, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit ac regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Ash Wednesday, the start of Lent, adapted from Caesarius, *Sermo* 146.1–3 (CCSL 104, pp. 599–602).

20. 38r–40r. .xx. Omelia in Quadragesima. Dominica .i. Audite, filioli mei, et intelligite, quomodo sacra scriptura uos ammonet, et ad regna caelorum inuitate, et uiam ostendit … / … Haec precepta implendi uirtutem nobis prestare dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Quadragesima, the First Sunday in Lent, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 200–8. This sermon draws substantially from Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 64 *ad fratres in eremo* (PL 40:1347); Caesarius, *Sermo* 183.1 (CCSL 104, p. 744); Theodulf, *Capitula* 28, 34, 37–39, 41, 44 (PL 105:200–5); and Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* 3 (PL 101:615). Another copy occurs in St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 614 (s. x), pp. 19–26. See CPPM I, 1191.

21. 40r–42v. .xxi. Item alia in die initii. /40v/ Rogo et ammoneo uos, fratres karissimi, ut in isto legitimo ac sacratissimo tempore … / … Haec mandata in nobis implere Saluator

mundi dignetur, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Quadragesima, the First Sunday in Lent, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 209–16, with borrowings from Caesarius, *Sermo* 199 (CCSL 104, pp. 803–5 and 808; AF 1.52); Caesarius, *Sermo* 188 (CCSL 104, pp. 768–70); and Theodulf, *Capitula* 23 (PL 105:198).

22. 42v–46r. .xxii. Omelia in Dominica .ii. in Quadragesima. /43r/ Primum omnium tria quaedam unicuique homini pernecessaria sunt: fides, spes, caritas … / … Haec in nobis implere dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre /46r/ et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Second Sunday in Lent, ed. Helen L. Spencer, "Vernacular and Latin Versions of a Sermon for Lent: 'A Lost Penitential Homily' Found," *MS* 44 (1982), 283–91. Earlier discussion by Joan Turville-Petre, "Translations of a Lost Penitential Homily," *Traditio* 19 (1963), 51–78. Contains borrowings from Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* 4, 10, 12, 13, 16, and 17 (PL 101:616–26); Hrabanus, *De institutione clericorum* 2, 9, ed. Detlev Zimpel, *Hrabanus Maurus, De institutione clericorum*, 2 vols., Fontes Christiani 61 (Turnhout, 2006), 1:131–34, 160; the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* 12–14, ed. Hermann Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1885; repr. Darmstadt, 1966), pp. 33–41; and Theodulf, *Capitula* 31 (PL 105:201). This entire sermon was translated into Old English as Vercelli III (HomS 11.2) and (selectively) as Belfour VI (HomS 15) and into Old Icelandic as the Rogationtide sermon *In capite ieiunij*, ed. Theodor Wisén, *Homiliu-bók: Isländska homilier efter en handskrift från tolfte århundradet* (Lund, 1872), pp. 61–64; cf. Andrea de Leeuw van Weenen, ed., *The Icelandic Homily Book: Perg. 15 4° in the Royal Library, Stockholm*, Icelandic Manuscripts Series in Quarto 3 (Reykjavík, 1993), fols.

29v–31r (facsimile with diplomatic transcription). Its influence on early Middle English sermons is discussed by Stephen Pelle, "Newly Recovered English Homilies from Cotton Otho A. XIII," *RES* n.s. 65 (2013), 212–13.

23. 46r–48r. .xxiii. Omelia in Dominica .iii. in Quadragesima. Oportet nos, fratres karissimi, omni die dominico ad ęcclesias Dei cum humilitate et silentio et sobrietate conuenire … / … mercedem accipere in caelestibus, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Third Sunday in Lent, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 222–30, with borrowings from Caesarius, *Sermo* 13.3 (CCSL 103, p. 66); Theodulf, *Capitula* 24–27 (PL 105:198–200); and Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* 21 and 26 (PL 101:629 and 632).

24. 48r–50v. .xxiiii. Omelia in Dominica .iiii. in Quadragesima. Quicumque uult saluus esse, ante omnia opus est ut teneat catholicam fidem … / … quanta et qualia sunt quę pręparauit Deus his qui diligunt eum. Haec omnia nobis prestare dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A penitential sermon for the Fourth Sunday in Lent, with borrowings from Caesarius, *Sermo* 3 (CCSL 103, pp. 20–21); Caesarius, *Sermo* 57 (CCSL 103, pp. 252–54); and Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo Caillau-Saint-Ives* 2.19, ed. *Bibliotheca Monachorum Ordinis S. Benedicti Abbatiae Montis Casini* [*Florilegium Casinense*], 5 vols. (Monte Cassino, 1873–94), 1:130–31 (see Dolbeau, "Du nouveau sur un sermonnaire de Cambridge," p. 257).

25. 50v–52v. .xxv. Omelia in Dominica .v[a]. in Quadragesima. Spiritus sanctus per Isaiam prophetam hortatur nos et ammonet dicens: *Querite Dominum dum inueniri potest* (Isa. 55:6) … / … et congregatio iustorum ibi semper manentium. Cum quibus haec omnia uidere et possidere mereamur. Largiente Domino nostro Iesu Christo, cui est honor et imperium et potestas una cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Fifth Sunday in Lent, with echoes of Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* 6 (PL 101:617), and the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* 22.2, ed. Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, p. 74. On the parallels between a passage in this sermon (at fols. 50v/28–51r/13); the *Dicta Sancti Effrem II* in Vatican City, BAV, Pal. lat. 220 (Middle or Upper Rhineland, in Anglo-Saxon script, s. ix[in]), fols. 22v–23v; the *Apocrypha Priscillianistica* in Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek Aug. perg. 254 (Novara, s. viii/ix), fols. 154v–55r (ed. Donatien de Bruyne, "Fragments retrouvés d'apocryphes priscillianistes," *RB* 24 [1907], 322); a Three Utterances sermon in Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek 44 (s. xiii), fol. 105v; and the Old English homily known as Fadda I (HomM 5, B3.5.5), see Charles D. Wright, "More Latin Sources for the Old English 'Three Utterances' Homilies," *MS* 77 (2015), 53–55.

26. 52v–56r. .xxvi. Omelia in dominica die Palmarum. /53r/ Dominus per prophetam prędicatoribus loquitur, dicens: Aperi os tuum, et ego adimplebo illud … / … ut in dextera Dei Patris constituti ibi semper fulgeamus. Sicut Saluator ait: *Fulgebunt iusti sicut sol in regno Patris eorum* (Matt. 13:43), semper quę lętemur et conregnemus cum illo in perpetua uita per infinita saecula saeculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Palm Sunday, with parallels in *Catechesis Celtica*, *Sermones* 13 and 14 (Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 49, fols. 13r–16r).

27. 56r–58r. .xxvii. Item alia. Factum est autem postquam emundasset Iesus templum suum ab omnibus scan/56v/dalis … / … Sicut apostolos [*sic*] ait: *Templum Dei uiui estis, et Spiritus sanctus habitat in uobis* (1 Cor. 3:16). Haec nobis prestare dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in saecula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Palm Sunday, with parallels in *Catechesis Celtica*, *Sermones* 14 and 16 (Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 49, fols. 14r–16v).

28. 58r–63r. .xxviii. Alia omelia in die Palmarum. Dominus ad prophetam Iezechiel, cum mitteret eum ad praedicandum filiis Israel … / … Sed conuiuit cum angelis semper lętus numquam tristis, ubi lux permanet et uita regnat sancta Trinitas. Amen.

A sermon for Palm Sunday consisting largely of quotations from Scripture.

29. 63r–65v. .xxviii. Omelia in caena Domini. /63v/ Oportet hoc scire et intelligere, fratres karissimi, quod hęc dies, id est quinta feria, in qua caena Domini … / … merebitur a Domino Iesu remunerante percipere, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Holy Thursday that is virtually identical to *Catechesis Celtica*, *Sermo* 17 (Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 49, fols. 16v–17r), which itself includes borrowings from Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* 55.7, 56.1, 56.3, and 58.5 (CCSL 36, pp. 466–68 and 474–75); Alcuin, *Expositio in Iohannis Evangelium* 32.13 (PL 100:924–26); and Caesarius, *Sermo* 202 (CCSL 104, 814–15).

30. 65v–73r. .xxviiii. Omelia in Parasceuen de Passione Domini. Hoc primum omnium inquirendum est humano generi, qualiter mundus a principio creatus et formatus est … / … Haec nobis in cęlestibus prestare dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Good Friday, based on Genesis 1–3, with borrowings from Pseudo-Caesarius, *Sermo* 17 (PL 67:1079); and Augustine, *Sermo* Mai 80.1–3, ed. Angelo Mai, *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae* I (Rome, 1852), pp. 156–58. Discussion by Charles D. Wright, "Why the Left Hand Is Longer (or Shorter) than the Right: Some Irish Analogues for an Etiological Legend in the Homiliary of St. Père de Chartres," in *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Virginia Blanton and Helene Scheck, MRTS 334; Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance 24 (Tempe, Arizona, 2008), pp. 161–68. See also the discussion above, pp. 000–000.

31. 73r–75r. .xxx. Item alia. Parasceuen, id est .vi[ta]. dies sabbati, que preparatio interpretatur, eo quod omnia que in sabbato necessaria sunt … / … In hac iterum die uespera cum silentio cęlebratur ut dominicę sepulturę quieti ueneratio exhibeatur in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Good Friday, drawing from Hrabanus, *De institutione clericorum* 2.37, ed. Zimpel, 2:336–44; Amalarius, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* 1.13–14 (PL 105:1024–32); and Adomnán, *De locis sanctis* 3.3, ed. Denis Meehan, *Adomnáns De locis sanctis*, Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 3 (Dublin, 1958), p. 110.

32. 75r–75v. .xxxi. `Omelia´ in sabbato sancto. Sabbati paschalis ueneratio ideo caelebratur et colitur, quia in eadem die Dominus in sepulchro quieuit … / … et purificatis mentibus obuiam Christo crastina die ex mortuis resurgenti occurrere debemus, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Holy Saturday adapted from Hrabanus Maurus, *De institutione clericorum* 2.38, ed. Zimpel, 2:344–46.

32a. 75v–77r. Item alia in sabbato. Iudęi ergo quoniam Parasceue erat ut non remanerent in cruce corpora sabbato … / … ut uirtutibus diuinis possit impleri, te donante Iesu Christe, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuis et regnas Deus per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Holy Saturday adapted from Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* 120.1–5 (CCSL 36, pp. 661–63; AF 1.93).

33. 77r–79v. .xxxii. Omelia in die sancto Paschae. Spiritus sanctus per prophetam populo christiano diem solemnem constituere hortatur et ammonet … / … nos collocari et congaudere mereamur, prestante eodem Domino nostro Iesu Christo qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Easter, with borrowings from Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum* 117 (CCSL 97, p. 1057); Jerome, *In Matthaeum* (CCSL 77, pp. 279–80); and Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 167 (PL 39:2069–70).

34. 79v–81r. .xxxiii. Item alia de resurrectione Domini. Videte, fratres karissimi, et considerate quam carissimos nos Dominus habere dignatus est … / … ad salutem animę nostrę ut cum illo regnemus in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Easter, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 166–70, with borrowings from Pseudo-Caesarius, *Sermo* 17 (PL 67:1080); Caesarius, *Sermo* 57.3 (CCSL 103, p. 252); and Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 136.6 (PL 39:2015).

35. 81r–83r. .xxxiiii. Omelia octauas Paschę. Paulisper de ministratoribus persecutionis Christi, quid actum sit uideamus, fratres karissimi, primus itaque Herodes … / … Lętentur ergo omnes populi solemnitatem caelebrantes resurrectionis Christi cuius est gloria cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Octave of Easter on the deaths of Herod and Pilate and the siege of Jerusalem, with borrowings from the Eusebius/Rufinus *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.8, 2.6–7, 2.10, and 3.6–8, ed. Theodor Mommsen, *Die Kirchengeschichte: Die Lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus*, Vol. II of *Eusebius Werke*, ed. Eduard Schwartz, 3 vols., Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 9.1–3 (Leipzig, 1903–9), pp. 65–71, 121, 123, 129–31, 211, and 217–18.

36. 83v–85v. .xxxv. Omelia in rogatione. Feria .ii. Scitis, fratres karissimi, quod istos quattuor dies cum summa diligentia custodire debetis … / … caelestium bonorum mereamur esse consortes, eodem Domino nostro Iesu Christo donante, cuius oboedientia redemti sumus, cui est honor et imperium et potestas una cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A Rogationtide sermon with no identified sources, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 102–10. A fragmentary copy in Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Msc.Bibl.30a (?Northern Francia, s. x^{in}), fols. 4a–b, and a copy in Angers, BM 236 (France, s. $xi^{?2}$, prov. Saint-Aubin, Angers), fols. 58v–61r, are discussed by Winfried Rudolf, "An Early Manuscript Witness of the Homiliaries of Angers and St. Père de Chartres in Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, MS Msc.Bibl.30a," *JML* 27 (1917), 1–40, who provides a diplomatic transcription of the Bamberg fragment of this sermon at pp. 33–35. The connections between this sermon and a Rogationtide sermon in Paris, BnF, lat. 1012 (Northern Francia, s. $ix^{1/3}$), fols. 72v–74v, are discussed by James McCune, "The Sermon Collection in the Carolingian Clerical Handbook, Paris, BnF, lat. 1012," *MS* 75 (2013), 46 and 71–72. About half of this sermon was translated into Old English in Vercelli XIX (HomS 34).

37. 85v–87v. .xxxvi. Alia in .iii. feria. Sermo beati Maximi episcopi. Legimus in prophetis

cum Niniue ciuitati subuersio immineret … / … Deum conuocat in adiutorium illi. Hęc nobis prestare dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Tuesday in Rogationtide, pieced together from Maximus, *Sermo* 81 (CCSL 23, pp. 332–34) and the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* 12.3 and 13.2, ed. Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, pp. 34, 38–39.

38. 87v–90r. .xxvii. Alia in .iiii. feria in Letania Maiore. Ecce, fratres karissimi, dies sancti ac spiritales et animę nostrę medicinales adsunt … / … per benignam oboedientiam perueniat ad coronam glorię, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, cui est honor et imperium in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Wednesday in Rogationtide, adapted from Caesarius, *Sermo* 207 (CCSL 104, pp. 828–31).

39. 90r–91r. <S>cire et intelligere debemus, fratres karissimi, quod dies conpunctionis et poenitentię modo cęlebramus … / … ad remedium possitis indulgentie et ad coronam glorię peruenire, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, cui est honor et imperium et potestas, una cum Patre et Spiritu sancto in secula seculorum. Amen.

A Rogationtide sermon adapted from Caesarius, *Sermo* 208 (CCSL 104, pp. 832–34; AF 2.18).

40. 91r–93v. .xxxviiii. Item alia. Oportet nos, fratres dilectissimi, annuntiare uobis quod modo dies sanctificati ac uenerabiles sunt … / … in cordibus nostris perfundat, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum eo et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A Rogationtide sermon with no known sources, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 111–18. Portions of this sermon were translated into Old English in Vercelli XIX (HomS 34).

41. 93v–95v. .xl. Omelia in Ascensione Domini. Vocem iocunditatis ac dulcedinis de resurrectione Domini ac uictoria Christi annuntiate … / … et tecum uitam habeamus aeternam per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Ascension Day, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 179–86, with substantial borrowings from Gregory the Great, *Hom*. 29 *in Evang*. 1–4 (CCSL 141, 244–49; PD 2.28); Bede, *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum* (CCSL 121, p. 8); an antiphon (Hesbert, no. 4079); and with parallels in an unpublished sermon in Munich, clm 6233 (as above, art. 11), fols. 158v–59v.

42. 95v–97r. .xlii. Item alia in eodem die. Gloriari nos oportet semper, fratres karissimi, et gaudere, quia Dominus ac Redemptor noster … / … nos perducere dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Ascension Day, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 188–94. Most of this homily and the preceding one (art. 41) were translated into Old English in Tristram III (HomS 45), a homily composed at Canterbury in the late-tenth century.

43. 97r–99v. .xliii. Omelia in die sancto Pentecosten. Factum est, fratres karissimi, cum impleta essent omnia quę de aduentu Domini in carne predixerant prophete … / … Benedicat nos ergo Pater, sanet nos Filius, repleat nos Spiritus sanctus, hic in ęterna secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Pentecost, with borrowings from Gregory the Great, *Hom*. 30 *in Evang*. (CCSL 141, pp. 262–65; PD 2.33); and parallels in an unpublished sermon in Munich, clm 6233 (as above, art. 11), fols. 161v–66r.

44. 99v–102r. .xliiii. Omelia in natale sancti Iohannis Baptistae. Ad inluminandum humanum genus, quod per inuidiam diaboli perierat … / … semper in cęlestibus habitare cum Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Nativity of John the Baptist (24 June) with borrowings from Caesarius, *Sermo* 216 (CCSL 104, pp. 858–61; AF 2.39).

45. 102r–5v. .xlv. Omelia in natale sancti Petri apostoli. De sancto Petro apostolo, primo et principe apostolorum, hodie nos oportet loqui … / … gaudeamus in regnis caelestibus, te donante Iesu Christe, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuis et regnas Deus, per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Nativity of Saint Peter (29 June) with parallels in an unpublished sermon in Munich, clm 6233 (as above, art. 11), fols. 135av–42v; and echoes of the *Passio ss. Petri et Pauli* (BHL 6657), ed. R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1891–1903), 1:171 and 173.

46. 105v–8v. .xlvi. Omelia in natale sancti Pauli apostoli. Audite me, filioli mei, et liberate uos; currite pro uobis in bonis operibus et nobis beneficium prestate … / … et obsecrare debemus, largiente `Domino nostro´ Iesu Christo, qui coequalis et coeternus uiuit et regnat cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Nativity of Saint Paul (29 June) with borrowings from Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 204 (PL 39:2124–25; AF 2.48) and parallels in an unpublished sermon in Munich, clm 6233 (as above, art. 11), fols. 144r–50r.

47. 108v–11v. .xlvii. Omelia in natale martyrum in kalendas Agusti. Venerari nos oportet, fratres karissimi, hanc solemnitatem Machabeorum, quę hodie celebratur et colitur … / … sed cęleste regnum et gaudium sempiternum et exultatio preclara sine fine per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Nativity of Martyrs with readings from 2 Macc. 6–7 and borrowings from Caesarius, *Sermo* 13.1–4 (CCSL 103, pp. 65–67).

48. 111v–13v. .xlviii. Item alia de sapientia. Primum omnium inquirendum est omni homini Deum scire uolenti, fratres karissimi, quę sit uera scientia … / … Deum diligentes et caritate splendentes, benigni et pacifici, et omnium sanctorum chori, cum Domino semper gaudentes in regnis caelestibus per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon on wisdom, with borrowings from Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* 1 (PL 101:614–15) and Hrabanus, *De institutione clericorum* 3.37, ed. Zimpel, 2:604–30.

49. 113v–17v. .xlviiii. In Assumptione sanctę Mariae. Sciendum est, fratres karissimi, et omnibus exponendum fidelibus, quod post ascensionem Domini … / … et ipsa intercedat pro nobis ad Dominum Iesum Christum ut mereamur uitam possidere ęternam, per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Assumption of the Virgin Mary (15 August), adapted from the *W* recension of the apocryphal *Transitus Mariae* (BHL 5352b–p), ed. André Wilmart, "L'ancien récit latin de l'Assomption," in Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia: Extraits des manuscrits latins de la Reine Christine conservés au Vatican* (Vatican City, 1933), pp.

323–57. The Pembroke 25 text is edited by Mary Clayton, *The Apocryphal Gospels of Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*, CSASE 26 (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 328–33. CPPM I, 5019.

50. 117v–19v. .xlxi. [*sic*] Omelia in passione sancti Iohannis Baptistę. Valde honorandus est nobis, fratres karissimi, sanctus Iohannes Baptista, cuius hodie solemnitatem agimus … / … ubi est honor perfectus et letitia sine fine, ubi est beatitudo eaeterna et caelestis gloria permanens in saecula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Decollation of John the Baptist (29 August), with parallels in an unpublished sermon in Munich, clm 6233 (as above, art. 11), fols. 167r–71r; and with borrowings from Adomnán, *De locis sanctis* 2.23.2–3, ed. Meehan, p. 92. On a brief parallel between an *ubi sunt* passage in this sermon (at fol. 119v/12–14), the bilingual Irish-Latin *Sermo ad reges* in the Leabhar Breac (ed. Robert Atkinson, *The Passions and Homilies from the Leabhar Breac*, Todd Lecture Series 2 [Dublin, 1887], pp. 414–18 [Latin text], at p. 418), and the OE Fadda I (HomM 5, B3.5.5), see Charles D. Wright, "More Latin Sources for the Old English 'Three Utterances' Homilies," *MS* 77 (2015), 60–61.

51. 119v–22r. .li. Omelia in natiuitate sancte Mariae. Inquirendum est, fratres karissimi, et explanandum per ordinem de origine generis Mariae … / … possidere gaudia sempiterna, prestante eodem Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary (8 September), adapted from a Latin redaction of the apocryphal *Protevangelium Jacobi* (BHL 5333m–t), ed. J. M. Canal, "Antiguas Versiones latinas del Protoevangelio de Santiago," *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 18 (1968), 431–73. The Pembroke 25 text is printed by Clayton, *The*

Apocryphal Gospels of Mary, pp. 319–22. It is edited together with five other manuscript witnesses by Jean-Daniel Kaestli, "Le *Protévangile de Jacques* latin dans l'homélie *Inquirendum est* pour la fête de la Nativité de Marie," *Apocrypha* 12 (2001), 99–153 (see above, p. 000 and n. 000).

52. 122r–23v. .lii. Omelia in .iiii^{or}. tempora. Ecce dies confessionis et humillimae supplicationis adsunt, fratres karissimi, et ideo ammoneo uos … / … prout ualeat faciat bonum quod precepit Dominus. Haec nobis prestare dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for Ember Days with no known sources.

53. 123v–24v. .liii. Item alia. Oportet nos, fratres karissimi, ad primum sanctę religionis fundamentum catholicam fidem tenere, in qua salus animarum corporumque redditur … / … quod his omnibus maius est dare nobis digneris participationem et societatem cum sanctis tuis in aeterna claritate et in beatitudine celestis gaudii per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum.

A sermon for Ember Days with no known sources.

54. 125r–27r. .liiii. Omelia in festiuitate sancti Michaelis archangeli. Angeli grece uocantur, aebraice malaoth, latine uero nuntii interpretantur … / … quod clamat ter sanctus alter ad alterum Trinitatis in una diuinitate demonstrat ministerium per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the feast of Saint Michael the archangel (29 September), adapted from Isidore, *Etymologiae* 7.5.1–29, ed. W. M. Lindsay, *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, 2 vols., Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis (Oxford, 1911), pp. 274–77.

55. 127r–29r. .lv. Item alia. Memorari et recitare decet memoriam sancti Michaelis, fratres karissimi, cunctis gentibus, toto orbe terrarum dispersis … / … de quibus locuti sumus peruenire mereamur, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the feast of Saint Michael the archangel (29 September), edited and discussed by J. E. Cross, "An Unpublished Story of Michael the Archangel and Its Connections," in *Magister Regis: Studies in Honor of Robert Earl Kaske*, ed. Art Groos with Emerson Brown, Jr., Giuseppe Mazzotta, Thomas D. Hill, and Joseph S. Wittig (New York, 1986), pp. 23–35. The passage from Cross's edition concerning Michael's encounter with the dragon is reprinted with an English translation by Christine Rauer, *Beowulf and the Dragon: Parallels and Analogues* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 158–61.

56. 129r–v. .lvi. Omelia in solemnitate omnium sanctorum in kalendis Nouembris. Legimus in aecclesiasticis historiis, fratres karissimi, quod sanctus Bonifatius … / … ad superna gaudia caelorum peruenire ualeamus, largiente Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A single lection for the feast of All Saints (1 November) taken from the early Carolingian sermon "Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis" (BHL 6332d; CPL 1368 [*sermo* 71]; CPPM I, 4046, 6074), ed. J. E. Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis': A Sermon for All Saints, and Its Use in Old English Prose," *Traditio* 33 (1977), 105–6 (lines 1–17). The sermon's authorship by Helisachar († ante 840 A.D.), the chancellor to Louis the Pious who was at one time abbot of Saint-Aubin in Angers (818 A.D.), of Saint-Maximin near Trier (821 A.D.), and of Saint-Riquier (822–37 A.D.), was first suggested on the basis of a single manuscript ascription by Henri Barré, "La lettre du Pseudo-Jérome sur l'Assomption: Est-elle antérieur à Paschase Radbert?" *RB* 68 (1958),

211–12. Barré's argument was rejected due to "insufficient evidence" by Cross, "Legimus," p. 128, but it has since been accepted by Michel Huglo, "Trois livres manuscrits presentés par Helisachar," *RB* 99 (1989), 274; François Dolbeau, "Critique d'attribution, critique d'authenticité. Réflexions préliminaires," *Filologia Mediolatina* 6–7 (1999–2000), 37–38, who cautions, however, that Helisachar's authorship cannot be proven; Benedetta Valtorta, ed., *Clavis Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi. Auctores Italiae (700–1000)*, Edizione nazionale dei testi mediolatini 17, Serie 1.10 (Florence, 2006), p. 10; Roger Gryson, *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l'antiquité et du haut Moyen Âge*, 5th ed., 2 vols., Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 1/1[5] (Freiburg, 2007), 1:335; and Thomas Falmagne with assistance from Luc Deitz, *Die Echternacher Handschriften bis zum Jahre 1628 in den Beständen der Bibliothèque nationale de Luxembourg sowie der Archives diocésaines de Luxembourg, der Archives nationales, der Section historique de l'Institut grand-ducal und des Grand Séminaire de Luxembourg. Teil 1: Quellen und Literaturverzeichnis, Einleitung, Abbildungen* (Wiesbaden, 2009), pp. 193–94. It is rejected as spurious by Jean-Paul Bouhot in *Clavis des auteurs latins du Moyen Age: Territoire français 735–987. Tomus III: Faof–Hilduin*, ed. Marie-Hélène Jullien, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis (Turnhout, 2010), p. 413, who argues that the sermon was composed shortly before the year 800 A.D. within the circle of Arno of Salzburg (d. 821 A.D.). This sermon was composed no later than the second quarter of the ninth century, the date of the earliest manuscript (Munich, BSB, clm 6314 [Freising, *c.* 825 × 835 A.D.], fols. 198v–205v). On the sermons for All Saints in the Pembroke 25 collection, see Thomas N. Hall, "The Development of the Common of Saints in the Early English Versions of Paul the Deacon's Homiliary," in *Anglo-Saxon Books and Their Readers: Essays in Celebration of Helmut Gneuss's Handlist of Anglo-Saxon*

Manuscripts, ed. Thomas N. Hall and Donald Scragg, Publications of the Richard Rawlinson Center (Kalamazoo, 2008), pp. 44–48 and 59.

57. 129v–30r. .lvii. Alia. Nunc ergo, fratres karissimi, in omnium primordiis sanctorum nobis nominare, laudare, et glorificare condecet eum qui cunctos condidit sanctos … / … aut quis prior dedit illi et retribuetur ei? Quoniam ex ipso et per ipsum et in ipso sunt omnia ipsi honor et gloria in secula seculorum. Amen.

    A single lection taken from the All Saints sermon, ed. Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis,'" pp. 106–7, lines 18–36.

58. 130r–v. lviii. De angelis atque archangelis. Qui superna cęlorum regna spiritibus angelicis ad gloriam et laudem atque honorem sui nominis ac maiestatis … / … ut ad eos de quibus loquimur peruenire ualeamus, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

    A single lection taken from the All Saints sermon, ed. Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis,'" pp. 107–10, lines 37–60.

59. 130v–31r. .lviiii. Item alia de sancta Maria et ceteris uirginibus. /131r/ O beata Dei genitrix et semper uirgo Maria, templum Domini, sacrarius locus Spiritus sancti, uirgo ante partum … / … Hęc omnia nobis et omnibus fidelibus prestare dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

    A single lection taken from the All Saints sermon ed Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis,'" pp. 117–19, lines 165–81.

60. 131r–v. Adhuc tamen aliquid de hac eadem tam pulchra atque preclara festiuitate loqui incipiamus … / … confortes esse mereamur in regnis cęlestibus, largiente Domino

nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuiuit [*sic*] et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A single lection taken from the All Saints sermon ed Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis,'" pp. 110–11, lines 61–71, and p. 122 (§3).

61. 131v–32r. .lxi. De prophetis. Hos sequitur electio prophetarum cum quibus locutus est Dominus et ostendit illis secreta sua … / … sed consortes fieri eam intuendo speramus, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A single lection taken from the All Saints sermon, ed. Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis,'" pp. 111–12, lines 75–90.

62. 132r. .lxii. Item alia de apostolis. Huic tam pulchrae solemnitati concordat et concęlebrat duodenus apostolorum numerus … / … haec dies subiecta declaratur et meritis, largiente Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A single lection taken from the All Saints sermon, ed. Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis,'" pp. 113–14, lines 106–22.

63. 132r–33r. .lxiii. De martyribus. /132v/ His subiectum est triumphale martyrum nomen, qui per diuersa tormentorum genera … / … lucis principem, lętitie largitorem, qui uiuit et regnat cum Deo Patre in unitate Spiritus sancti per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

A single lection taken from the All Saints sermon, ed. Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis,'" p. 115, lines 124–33, and p. 122 (§4), with echoes of Cyprian, *De mortalitate* 26 (CSEL 3.1.313–14).

64. 133r–v. .lxiiii. Item alia de ordinibus omnium sanctorum. Hodie, dilectissimi, omnium sanctorum sub una solemnitatis lętitia caelebramus festiuitatem … / … qui coronis aureis clarificat sanctos suos in regnis cęlestibus, cui est honor et imperium et potestas una cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A Carolingian sermon for All Saints (1 November) printed as Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 209 (PL 39:2135–37) and as Pseudo-Bede, *Hom*. 3.70 (PL 94:450–52), but possibly authored by Helisachar of Saint-Riquier, as argued by Germain Morin, *Études, textes, découvertes: Contributions a la littérature et a l'histoire des douze premiers siècles* (Maredsous, 1913), pp. 498–99; Henri Barré, "Sermons marials inédits 'in Natali Domini,' " *Marianum: Ephemerides Mariologiae* 25 (1963), 51–52; and Joseph Lemarié, "L'homéliaire 48.12 de la Bibliothèque capitulaire de Tolède. Témoins de deux sermons anciens inédits et du sermon 'Quod nos hortatus est dominus noster,' " *Revue des études augustiniennes* 27 (1981), 281. Helisachar's authorship is deemed possible but not certain by Machielsen, CPPM I, 994; Raymond Étaix, "Le lectionnaire liturgique de la cathédrale de Clerment au X^{e} siècle," in his *Homéliaires patristiques latins* (as above, under art. 5), pp. 316; and Gryson, *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins. Tome I*, pp. 283 and 335. See further CPL 1369; and Marie-Hélène Jullien and Françoise Perelman, *Clavis Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi. Auctores Galliae 735–987. Tomus II: Alcuinus* (Turnhout, 1999), pp. 491–92. Several copies are noted by C. Lambot, "Sermons inédits de s. Augustin pour les fêtes de saints," *RB* 59 (1949), 55; Maurice P. Cunningham, "Contents of the Newberry Library Homiliarium," 297; and Étaix, *Homéliaires patristiques latins*, pp. 83, 246, 281, 300, 316, and 349. See also Hall, "The Development of the Common of Saints," pp. 46–48 and 59.

65. 133v–36v. .lxv. Omelia in natale sancti Martini episcopi. /134r/ .i. Postquam Dominus noster Iesus Christus triumphator ad alta caelorum ascendit et in maiestate paterna consedit … / … ad celestia regna, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum eodem Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the feast of Saint Martin of Tours (11 November), adapted from Alcuin, *Laudationes s. Martini* 1–10 (PL 101:657–62; BHL 5625–26) and Sulpicius Severus, *Vita s. Martini* 2–8, 19 (CSEL 1, pp. 111–18, 128; BHL 5610). The Pembroke 25 text is printed by Frederick M. Biggs, "Ælfric as Historian: His Use of Alcuin's *Laudationes* and Sulpicius's *Dialogues* in His Two Lives of Martin," in *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints' Lives and Their Contexts*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, SUNY Series in Medieval Studies (Albany, NY, 1996), pp. 303–6.

66. 136v–38v. .lvi. Item alia. /137r/ Oportet nos omnes unanimiter gaudere, fratres karissimi, et pręclarum diem obitus sancti Martini fideliter uenerari … / … consolationes merentium et pietates lętantium, prestante Domino fieri solent, qui uiuit et regnat in unitate maiestatis diuine per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

Another sermon for the feast of Saint Martin of Tours (11 November), adapted from Alcuin, *Sermo de transitu s. Martini* (PL 101:662–64; BHL 5626).

67. 138v–40v. .lxvii. Omelia in natale sancti Andreae apostoli. Ecce adest dies honorabilis sancti Andreę apostoli. Viriliter agite, fratres karissimi, sectando precepta Saluatoris … / … et ad agnitionenem [*sic*] ueritatis uenire, cui est honor et imperium et potestas una cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the feast of Saint Andrew (30 November), partially adapted from the *Passio s. Andreae apostoli* (BHL 428), ed. R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1891–1903), 2.1:3–37.

68. 140v–41v. .lxviii. Natale omnium apostolorum. Benedictus Deus et Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi, cui quidem soli ab hominibus reddenda est benedictio … / … et postea in Iesu Christo semper glorificabunt, qui est salus animarum credentium /141v/ in se hic et in aeterna secula seculorum. Amen.

An unsourced lection for the feast of the Apostles.

69. 141v–42r. .lxviiii. Item alia. Videte, fratres karissimi, qualem caritatem dedit nobis Pater ut Filii Dei nominemur … / … Beati qui timent Dominum, qui ambulant in uiis eius, hęc nobis prestare dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

An unsourced lection for the feast of the Apostles.

70. 142r–v. .lxx. Alia. Iustificati ex fide, fratres karissimi, pacem habeamus ad Deum … / … et de seruitute uocari ad regnum sempiternum. Haec omnia quidem habemus per Iesum Christum Saluatorem nostrum, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

An unsourced lection for the feast of the Apostles.

71. 142v–43v. .lxxi. Item alia. Scimus autem quoniam diligentibus Deum omnia concurrunt in bonum, his qui secundum propositum uocati sunt sancti … / … et tamen ipse a nullo continetur nec umquam regitur. Ex ipso enim et per ipsum et con ipso /143v/ sunt omnia uisibilia atque inuisibilia. Ipsa gloria et imperium et potestas per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

An unsourced lection for the feast of the Apostles.

72. 143v–45v. .lxxii. Item alia. Scire et intelligere debemus, fratres karissimi, quod beatus Paulus reuelat dicens, *Templum Dei uiui estis, et Spiritus sanctus habitat in uobis* (1 Cor. 3:16). In singulis itaque iustis et sanctis atque perfectis et in uniuersa sancta Dei aecclesia … / … simul gaudeatis in conspectu Dei quando *iusti fulgebunt sicut sol in regno Patris eorum* (Matt. 13:43) in perpetua uita sine fine per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

An unsourced lection for the feast of the Apostles.

73. 145v–48v. .lxxxiii. [*sic*] In natale plurimorum martyrum. Quotiescumque, fratres karissimi, sanctorum martyrum solemnia uoluntarie caelebramus … / … sed modo glorificant in sepulchro? Honoremus itaque, fratres, sanctos martyres ut eorum participes fieri mereamur `esse´ in caelis per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for martyrs, with borrowings from Caesarius, *Sermo* 223 (CCSL 104, pp. 882–85; AF 2.94) and Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 88 (PL 57:101–10).

74. 148v–51r. .lxxiiij. Omelia in natale plurimorum confessorum. Scriptum est, fratres karissimi, in euangelica lectione quod homo quidam peregre proficiscens uocauit seruos suos et tradidit illis bona sua … / … et hic summum meruit sacerdotium et postea apud Deum coronam confessionis accepit. Largiente Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum eodem Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon for the feast of multiple Confessors, adapted from Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 24 (PL 57:893–96; AF 2.102; CPPM I, 5958).

75. 151r–52v. .lxxv. Omelia in natale unius confessoris. Ad sancti ac beatissimi istius patris nostri Cuthberti, cuius hodie festa cęlebramus, fratres karissimi … / … Haec nobis per merita istius sancti prestare dignetur Saluator mundi, qui uenit saluare nos, cui est honor

et imperium et potestas una cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

Eusebius Gallicanus, *Hom*. 51 (CCSL 101A, pp. 593–603), here adapted as a sermon for the feast of Saint Cuthbert (20 March). CPL 966; CPPM I, 4668, 5810; AF 2.103; PD 2.106.

76. 152v–57r. .lxxvi. Omelia in natale uirginum. Saepe uos ammoneo, fratres karissimi, praua opera fugere huius mundi … / … ammonitio ante mentis oculos semper est ponenda, qua dicit: *Vigilate itaque, quia ne*/157r/*scitis diem neque horam* (Matt. 25:13). Haec ergo mala in presenti uita nobis aduersantia deuitare studeamus, fratres karissimi, ut caste et pie uiuentes in hoc seculo resurgere primi ac uigilanda studio coronati cum fiducia in die iudicii occurrere ualeamus nostro redemptori, cui est honor et imperium et potestas una cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

Gregory the Great, *Hom*. 12 *in Evang*. (CCSL 141, pp. 80–88; PD 2.22), with a brief added conclusion ("Haec ergo mala … secula seculorum. Amen") at fol. 157r/1–5.

77. 157r–59r. .lxxvii. Omelia in natale ecclesiae. Quotiescumque, fratres karissimi, altaris uel templi festiuitatem colimus … / … Dominus Deus omnipotens sub sua protectione perducere dignetur, qui in eternum uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

An adaptation of Caesarius, *Sermo* 227 (CCSL 104, pp. 897–900; CPPM I, 1014, 5951. AF 2.106; PD 2.127).

78. 159r–60r. .lxxviii. De officio misae et misterio atque orationibus canonicorum horarum sermo Rabani Mauri. Officium quidem missę magna ex parte ad solum pertinet sacerdotem … / … ascendit in solarium suum et expansis manibus ad caelum Deum deprecabatur assidue pro se et populo Israel et ciuitate sancta Hierusalem.

A sermon adapted from Hrabanus Maurus, *De institutione clericorum* 2.1–10 and 3.37, ed. Zimpel, 2:248–64 and 2:604–30, introducing the following ten articles, each of which serves as a single lection on one of the canonical hours, drawing from Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* 1–5 (PL 76:49–56); and the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* 24, ed. Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, pp. 75–76.

79. 160r–v. .lxxviiii. De matutina caelebratione. Primum ergo de matutinorum antiquitate Dauid propheta testis est dicens: *Deus Deus meus, ad te de luce uigilo*, et iterum (Ps. 62:2) … / … spes futurae resurrectionis creditur cum iusti et omnes ab hac temporali morte quasi a sopore somni resurgentes euigilabunt.

A lection on the canonical hours.

80. 160v. .lxxx. De officio .i. horae. Primę autem horę cęlebratio proinde fit … / … *Ambulate dum lucem habetis, ne forte tenebrę uos comprehendant* (John 12:35), et iterum, *qui ambulat in die non offendit* (John 11:9).

A lection on the canonical hours.

81. 160v. .lxxxi. De tertię horę caelebratione. Tertię horę officium ideo fit quia tertia hora Christi passio coepit cum per Iudęorum linguas iam tunc Dominus crucifixus est. Et post resurrectionem eius in die Pentecostes tertia hora Spiritus santus super apostolos descendit. Suo utique loco et numero ad probationem uenerabilis trinitatis Spiritus paraclitus descendit ad terras impleturus gratias quam Christus promisit.

A lection on the canonical hours.

82. 160v–61r. .lxxxii. De officio sextę horae. Sexta autem hora Christus in aram crucis ascendit ęterno Patri semetipsum offerens ut nos a potestate inimici et a perpetua /161r/

morte liberaret. Atque ideo conuenit ut ea nos hora orantes et deprecantes in laudibus eius inueniat qua ipse nos per suam passionem ad uitam ęternam restaurauit.

A lection on the canonical hours.

83. 161r. .lxxxiii. De officio none horę. Nona utique hora inde consecratur quia in ea Dominus pro inimicis postulans in manus Patris spiritum commendauit … / … Petrus inquit et Iohannes ascendebant in templum ad horam orationis nonam.

A lection on the canonical hours.

84. 161r–v. .lxxxiiij. De uespertina celebratione. Vespertinum officium in diurnę lucis occassus est cuius ex ueteri testamento solemnis est cęlebratio … / … De quo propheta dicit et uesperum super filios hominum producere facit.

A lection on the canonical hours.

85. 161v. .lxxxv. De completorio in confinio diei et noctis. De completis autem cęlebrandis etiam in patrum inuenimus exemplis … / … ut ipse qui hac hora quietem sepulchri intrauit nobis ęternam requiem in celis concedere dignetur.

A lection on the canonical hours.

86. 161v–62v. .lxxxvi. De nocturna celebratione. De uigiliarum quoque nocturnalium caelebratione antique est institutio … / … Iste autem est catholicus ordo diuinarum caelebrationum /162v/ qui ab uniuersa ecclesia incommutabiliter seruatur.

A lection on the canonical hours.

87. 162v. .lxxxvii. De ceteris legitimis orationibus. Sunt et aliae legitimę orationes quę sine ulla ammonitione debentur … / … Edent pauperes et saturabuntur et laudabunt Dominum qui requirunt eum uiuent corda eorum in seculum seculi.

A lection on the canonical hours.

88. 162v–65v. .lxxxviii. De discretione dogmatum iuxta qualitatem audientium. Hoc nosse debet unumquemque doctorem catholicum ut bene perpendat sui sermonis auditorum qualitatem … / … et nunc lucide regnant in caelo. Largiente Domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in sęcula seculorum. Amen.

A lection on the canonical hours.

89. 166r–68r. .lxxxviiii. Predicatio communis omnibus populis. Iuxta qualitatem audientium formari debet sermo doctorum ut ad sua singulis congruat … / … quod nobis paratum est ab initio mundi. Haec nobis prestare dignetur Saluator mundi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A penitential sermon with borrowings from a short text on the ills of the world printed by Angelo Mai, *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae* I (Rome, 1852), p. 182, as Dynamius Grammaticus, [*Epistola*] *ad discipulum suum* (see above, p. 000 and note 000).

90. 168r–70r. .xc. Predicatio de principibus et populis. Doctorum est omnes cum modestia ammonere quęcumque debeant agere … / … ubi pascuntur sancti in aeterna gloria per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon on just rulers and vices and virtues, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 156–60, with a parallel passage from the Old English translation in Vercelli XXI (HomM 13) on the Twelve Virtues of the Soul at p. 161. This sermon

draws from Gildas, *De excidio Britanniae* 62.2–4, ed. Michael Winterbottom, *Gildas, The Ruin of Britain and Other Documents*, Arthurian Period Sources 7 (Chichester, 1978), p. 117; and Pseudo-Basil, *Admonitio ad filium spiritualem* 2 (PL 103:686); and has numerous echoes of the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* 24–25, ed. Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, pp. 75–78. The sermon's reference to Gildas by name and to his *De excidio Britanniae* by the rare Old Breton-derived title *Ormesta Britanniae* (The Calamity of Britain, see Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, p. 156 line 9) is paralleled (only?) in the *Vita s. Pauli Aureliani* (BHL 6585), composed by the Breton author Wrmonoc of Landévennec in 884 A.D., which may hint at a Breton connection to one of the homilist's sources (see Léon Fleuriot, *Dictionaire des gloses en vieux breton*, Collection linguistique 62 [Paris, 1964], s.v. *ormest*; and the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources. Fascicule VIII: O*, prep. David Howlett with the assistance of T. Christchev and C. White [Oxford, 2003], s.v. *ormesta*).

91. 170r–71v. .xci. Predicatio bona omnibus Christianis. Quicumque uoluerit placere Deo primum requirat quo possit modo diligere eum … / … Haec omnia mereamur inuenire in regnum caelorum cum Christo Domino, qui uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon on loving God, ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 162–64, with a parallel passage from the Old English translation in Vercelli XXI (HomM 13) on the ways of the Lord at p. 165.

92. 171v–73r. .xcii. Sermo sancti Agustini ad predicandum cotidianis diebus. Oportet nos, fratres karissimi, ut tota mentis intentione inquirere et intelligere studeamus quare Christiani sumus … / … de qua poena nos pius Dominus eripere et ad caelestia regna

secum perducere dignetur, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

Caesarius, *Sermo* 16 (CCSL 103, pp. 76–78), omitting the first eight lines of Caesarius, and adding a novel conclusion at fol. 173r/5–6.

93. 173r–75r. .xciii. Predicatio bona de .viii. vitiis idemque virtutibus. Precauere nos oportet semper, fratres karissimi, octo uitia principalia … / … perpetualiter possidere dignus efficietur, prestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo, cui est honor et imperium et potestas, cum Patre et Spiritu sancto, per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon adapted from Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* 27–35 (PL 101:633–38), ed. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 128–38; also ed. Paul E. Szarmach, "Pembroke College 25, Arts. 93–95," in *Via Crucis: Essays on Early Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross*, ed. Thomas N. Hall with assistance from Thomas D. Hill and Charles D. Wright, Medieval European Studies 1 (Morgantown, WV, 2002), pp. 308–13. A passage from fols. 174v–75r is also printed with an English translation by Szarmach, "Alfred's *Boethius* and the Four Cardinal Virtues," in *Alfred the Wise: Studies in Honour of Janet Bately on the Occasion of Her Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Jane Roberts and Janet L. Nelson with Malcolm Godden, (Cambridge, 1997), p. 231.

94. 175r–177v. .xciiii. Predicatio de preceptis Dei. /175v/ Sciendum est, fratres karissimi, quod primum credulitatis fundamentum est fides … / … Hęc in nobis impleat Dominus, qui uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon adapted from Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* 14, ed. Szarmach, "Pembroke College 25, Arts. 93–95," pp. 314–20. A passage from fol. 177r is separately printed by Szarmach, "Cotton Tiberius A. iii, Arts. 26 and 27," in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the*

Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday, ed. Michael Korhammer with the assistance of Karl Reichl and Hans Sauer (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 35–37, as a parallel to the text of this chapter of Alcuin's treatise in Troyes, BM 1742 (Tours, after 799 A.D.), fols. 23v–25v, and to the two Old English versions of the same chapter in London, BL, Cotton Tiberius A. iii, fols. 105r–v (art. 26), and Vespasian D. xiv, fols. 115v–17r.

95. 177v–80r. .xcv. Item alia. Oportet nos, fratres karissimi, in sanctitate et iustitia semper seruire et placere Deo … / … inter angelicos choros gaudentes possidere mereamur. Largiente Domino nostro Iesu Christo, cui est regnum, honor et uirtus, potestas et imperium, una cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per infinita secula seculorum. Amen.

A sermon adapted from Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* 26, ed. Szarmach, "Pembroke College 25, Arts. 93–95," pp. 321–25. A passage from fols. 179v–80r is separately printed by Szarmach, "Cotton Tiberius A. iii, Arts. 26 and 27," p. 41, as a parallel to the text of this chapter of Alcuin's treatise in Troyes 1742, fols. 42r–v, and to the Old English version of the same chapter in Cotton Tiberius A. iii, fols. 105v–6r (art. 27).

96. 180r–v. De eo quod a cantoribus placide ac suaue canendum sit. Studendum summopere cantoribus est, ne donum sibi diuinitus conlatum uitiis foedent … / … quam id cum caritate insinuare gestiunt, a prelatis obnixe tenendus est.

A chapter on choral singing from the Council of Aachen in 816 A.D.: *Institutio canonicorum Aquisgranensis*, cap. 137, "De cantoribus," ed. Albert Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini* 1.1, MGH Concilia aevi Karolini 2 (Hannover, 1906), p. 414; ed. and trans. Jerome Bertram, *The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries. Critical Texts with*

Translations and Commentary, Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 122–23 (ed.) and 164–65 (trans.).

L1 New Manuscript Witnesses to the Homiliary of Angers

Aidan Conti, Stephen Pelle, and Winfried Rudolf

In recent years the Homiliary of Angers (HA) has been recognised as an important Latin source for the anonymous homiletic tradition in pre-Conquest England, but the impact of this collection on preaching in Old English remains to be fully uncovered.[1] HA constitutes a collection of simple, mainly exegetical preaching material that centres on Gospel (and to a lesser extent epistolary) readings and may have served as an important tool for providing biblical teaching to medieval lay populations across Europe at smaller and lesser known centres and institutions.[2] Although no full English vernacular adaptation of a single piece

[1] The first description of a manuscript containing this homiliary was provided by Juan Francisco Rivera Recio, "El 'Homiliarium Gothicum' de la Biblioteca Capitular de Toledo, homiliario romano del siglo IX/X," *Hispania Sacra* 4 (1951), 147–67. He published two homilies (162–63). On the preliminary designation "Homiliary of Angers," its nature, and unknown origin see the ground-breaking article by Raymond Étaix, "L'homéliaire carolingien d'Angers," *RB* 104 (1994), 148–90. For a study on the relevance of the collection to English preaching see Aidan Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha: a Previously Unidentified Homiliary in an Old English Manuscript, Oxford Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2004); see also his "The Taunton Fragment and the Homiliary of Angers: Context for New Old English," *RES* n.s. 60 (2009), 1–33 and his "The Circulation of the Old English Homily in the Twelfth Century: New Evidence from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343," in *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. Aaron J. Kleist, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17 (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 365–402. See further Helmut Gneuss, "The Homiliary of the Taunton Fragments," *N&Q* n.s. 52 (2005), 440–42. For the discovery of the Sloane fragments see Winfried Rudolf, "The Homiliary of Angers in Tenth-Century England," *ASE* 39 (2011), 163–92.

[2] On the evidence for preaching to the laity in the Carolingian empire see Rosamond McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms 789–895,* Royal Historical Society Studies in History 2 (London, 1977),

from the collection has survived, the 2004 discovery of the eleventh-century Taunton Fragment (Taunton, Somerset County Record Office, DD/SASC/1193/77), a fragmentary bilingual witness in which each Latin clause alternates with its English translation, suggests that the entire homiliary, a nearly complete set of addresses for the liturgical year, was available in Old English as well as Latin in England before the Conquest.[3] Moreover, selected passages of HA have been identified as building blocks of other late Old English and early Middle English homilies.[4] The Latin text of HA was probably available in England since the Benedictine Reform, if not before, though the exact means of transmission of HA to England remain to be explored.[5] At present HA remains the work of an anonymous author or an unidentified school[6]; we have no specific information regarding the institution at which the

pp. 80–114; for Anglo-Saxon England see Mary Clayton, "Homiliaries and Preaching in Anglo-Saxon England," *Peritia* 4 (1985), 207–42. On the literacy of the laity see especially Rosamond McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 211–70. On forms of transitional literacy see also Franz Bäuml, "Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy," *Speculum* 55 (1980), 237–65.

[3] Mechthild Gretsch, "The Taunton Fragment: A New Text from Anglo-Saxon England," *ASE* 33 (2004), 145–93. See also Rudolf, "The Homiliary of Angers," 181.

[4] Stephen Pelle, "The Seven Pains of Hell: The Latin Source of an Old English Homiletic Motif," *RES* n.s. 62 (2011), 167–80 and his "Source Studies in the Lambeth Homilies," *JEGP* 113 (2014), 36–48, 55–71.

[5] Rudolf, "The Homiliary of Angers," 181.

[6] The homiliary cannot be found among the lay collections studied by Henri Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre* (Vatican, 1962), pp. 1–30. It is also ignored by the otherwise useful overview of the Carolingian collections by Jean Longère, *La prédication médiévale* (Paris, 1983), pp. 41–46, and by the collection of papers in *Sermo doctorum: Compilers, Preachers, and Their Audiences in the Early Medieval West*, ed. Maximilian Diesenberger, Yitzhak Hen, and Marianne Pollheimer, Sermo 9 (Turnhout, 2013). For a discussion of Carolingian preaching in the same volume, see James McCune, "The Preacher's Audience, *c.* 800–*c.* 950," in *Sermo doctorum: Compilers: Preachers, and Their Audiences in the Early Medieval West*, ed. Maximilian Diesenberger, Yitzhak Hen, and Marianne Pollheimer, Sermo 9 (Turnhout, 2013), pp. 283–338.

collection was first produced, and little data, even, on the place or region where it may have originated.[7] Efforts to establish an origin and patterns of dissemination are rendered more difficult by the likelihood that this collection tended to be used in "minor centres."[8] Adding to the complexity is HA's tendency to supplement or become supplemented by other collections, a process which may have started at least as early as ca. 900 A.D.[9] However, the recent identifications of no less than four hitherto unknown early manuscript witnesses in Angers, BM 55 (s. ix/x), Épinal, BM 161 (s. ix^2), Orléans, BM 179 (s. ix/x), and Paris, BnF, lat. 13768 (s. x^1) provide new information and promise a better understanding of the origins of this collection, which represents an important and widely distributed witness to the instruction of the laity mandated by the Carolingian *Admonitio generalis* of 789 A.D.[10] The purpose of this article is to offer a first description and brief assessment of this new manuscript evidence. On

[7] For the most recent discovery and analysis of a new fragmentary witness of s. x$^{in.}$, see Winfried Rudolf, "An Early Manuscript Witness of the Homiliaries of Angers and St. Père de Chartres in Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, MS Msc.Bibl.30a," *JML* 27 (2017), 1–40.

[8] See Elaine Treharne, "Scribal Connections in Late Anglo-Saxon England," in *Texts and Traditions of Medieval Pastoral Care: Essays in Honour of Bella Millett*, ed. Cate Gunn and Catherine Innes-Parker (York, 2009), pp. 29–46, esp. 41–42 and Rudolf, "The Homiliary of Angers," 173.

[9] For supplements from the so-called Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres see Rudolf, "Bamberg," 21–23.

[10] On the identification of the Épinal fragment by Lukas J. Dorfbauer, see the addendum in Rudolf, "Bamberg," 40. Dorfbauer also recently identified the textual witness in Angers, BM 55 and we are much indebted to him for bringing this discovery to our notice. The witnesses in Órleans, BM 149 and Paris, BnF, lat. 13768 were first discovered by Stephen Pelle. The text of the *Admonitio* has been edited by Alfred Boretius in MGH Capitularia regum Francorum 1 (Hanover, 1883), pp. 52–62. For the influence of the *Admonitio* and related legislation on the development of the Carolingian sermon, see Thomas L. Amos, "Preaching and the Sermon in the Carolingian World," in *De ore Domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*, ed. Thomas L. Amos, Eugene A. Green, and Beverly M. Kienzle (Kalamazoo, 1989), pp. 43–44; and McCune, "The Preacher's Audience," pp. 285–94.

the basis of this new material, we aim to offer some fresh ideas on the potential origins of this still understudied homiliary and further to explore its implications for early English preaching.

L2 The Homiliary of Angers: Background and Dissemination

The Homiliary of Angers received its present name in 1994 when Raymond Étaix published a detailed analysis of this cycle of homilies and its then thirteen known manuscript witnesses, as well as an edition of nine of the sixty pieces that he attributed to the collection.[11] Previously, only two HA items had been published (HA 19 and 49), both by Juan Rivera Recio from Toledo, Archivo y Biblioteca Capitular 33–1 (**T**) as part of what he had dubbed the "Homiliarum gothicum."[12] The name "Homiliary of Angers," derived for the sake of pragmatic convention from the eleventh-century manuscript Angers, BM 236 (**A**), conveys nothing about the origin or date of the collection, as Étaix himself emphasised.[13] Indeed, given the fact that no less than ten new witnesses have been discovered since Étaix's first study, and given the early dates and distribution of some of them, the title is probably misleading and may deserve a reassessment in the near future. While Étaix's earliest witnesses were the eponymous Angers manuscript (s. xi$^{med.}$) and Madrid, Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia, Aem. 39 (**Ma**, s. xi^{1}), more recent research has identified partial or complete manuscripts and fragments dating from as early as the late ninth century and added further witnesses up to as late as the fourteenth centuries. Including the new manuscript evidence discussed in this article, the following list records all known witnesses to

[11] For the edition see Étaix, "Angers," 177–89.

[12] Rivera Recio, "El 'Homiliarium Gothicum'." with an edition of HA 19 and 49. For a full set of manuscript sigla see the list below.

[13] Étaix, "Angers," 149.

date, grouped according to substantial HA collections (full letter sigla), selective witnesses (**X**) and fragments (**f**).[14]

A Angers, BM 236 (s. xi^{2}, provenance St Aubin, Angers);

Be Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, lat. oct. 359 (s. xii$^{med.}$, perhaps Spain);

Bu Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Clmae 481 (s. xi^{2}, provenance Northern Italy);

C Cambridge, St John's College, C. 12 (s. xiii, probably England);

E Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 44 (s. xiii^{1}, provenance Engelberg);

G Grenoble, BM 278 (s. xii, provenance Chartreuse of Pierre-Châtel);

K Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, CCl 888 (s. xiii, ?);

L Linz, Bundesstaatliche Studienbibliothek 222 (s. xiv, provenance Augustinian canons of Waldhausen, Austria);

Ma Madrid, Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia, Aem. 39 (s. xi^{1}, Spain);

Mu Munich, BSB, clm 12664 (s. xii, provenance regular canons of St Pancras, Redshofen, Austria);

O Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (s. xii^{2}, West Midlands, England);

T Toledo, Archivo y Biblioteca Capitular 33–1 (s. xii, Spain);

U_1 Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C 60 (s. xii and xiii, partly from England);

U_2 Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek, C 148 (s. xii^{2}, ?);

X_{Al} Albi, BM 15, fol. 157v (s. xi, ?);

X_{An} Angers, BM 55, flyleaf s.n. (s. ix/x, Western France);

X_{B} Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare 20, fols. 35v–36r (s. xii, ?);

[14] We have expanded and slightly modified the sigla used by Étaix, "Angers," 149 and Rudolf, "The Homiliary of Angers," 165–66.

X_D San Daniele del Friuli, Biblioteca Civica Guarneriana, Cod. 4, fols. 113 and 115 (s. xii/xiii, ?);

X_G Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. 829, fols. 4v–5r (s. xiii, ?);

X_{Om} Saint-Omer, BM 794, fols. 67r–69r and 70v–71r (s. xii, Saint-Bertin);

X_{Or} Orléans, BM 149, pp. 38–72 (s. ix/x, Fleury or Loire region);

X_{Ox} Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 26, fols. 88rb–vb (s. xiii$^{in.}$, England);[15]

X_P Paris, BnF, lat. 13768, fols. 61r–71v (s. x^1, Northern France?, Brittany?);

f_B Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Msc.Bibl.30a, fols. 1–5 (s. x$^{in.}$, France, provenance St Michael in Bamberg);

f_E Épinal, BM 161, fol. 139rv (s. ix$^{3/3}$, Lorraine?, provenance Moyenmoutier);

f_S London, BL, Sloane 280, fols. 1 and 286 (s. x^2, Canterbury);

f_T Taunton, Somerset County Record Office, DD/SAS C/1193/77 (s. xi^2, England).[16]

Evidence of the widespread use of the collection as a whole or in part is evidenced by the geographic range of the extant witnesses. While the majority seems to have originated in Francia (**A**, **G**, **X_{Al}**, **X_{An}**, **X_{Om}**, **X_{Or}**, **X_P**, **f_B**, **f_E**), at least two manuscripts come from the Iberian peninsula (**Ma** and **T**, perhaps also **Be**)[17]; another four (**O**, **X_{Ox}**, **f_S**, and **f_T**), possibly five (**C**), witnesses come from England; at least five originate from or are presently preserved in

[15] We are indebted to Charles D. Wright for sharing the identification of HA 55 in this manuscript with us. For a description of Hatton 26 see Jean Longère, *Les sermons latins de Maurice de Sully, Évêque de Paris († 1196)*, Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 16, pp. 203-211.

[16] Another HA manuscript without siglum of s. xiii (Southern Germany or Austria) is currently on sale at http://www.textmanuscripts.com/medieval/illuminated-thomas-aquinas-60994#. Accessed 2019 March 4.

[17] In addition to the direct manuscript evidence of HA's presence on the Iberian peninsula, there survive a number of vernacular homilies in Catalan and Navarrese that depend on the collection; for discussion and references, see Pelle, "Source Studies," 38–39.

centres near or in the Alps (**E**, **K**, **L**, **Mu**, **X_G**); two were potentially produced and used in Scandinavia (**U_1**, **U_2**); and items from the collection can be traced in Italian manuscripts (**Bu**, **X_B**, **X_D**). Indeed, as Rudolf has noted, "the flexible and accessible nature of these homilies seems to have been the key to their survival."[18] In addition to the textual fluidity that can be traced by comparing single witnesses, we may also note that the collection seems to have been flexible in its textual repurposing. In a lectionary written in Norway in the twelfth century, likely from the Augustinian house of Halsnøy, excerpts from HA 10 (Quinquagesima) and HA 13 (Third Sunday in Lent) appear alongside pieces by Augustine, Gregory, and Smaragdus.[19] If we know little of the origin of the homiliary, the Augustinians seem important to its continued use after its initial spread across Europe. This later use may have been facilitated by the attribution of the homilies to important, named authors like Augustine, Gregory, and Bede in certain manuscripts (a phenomenon that can be seen, for example, in **E**). In this regard, the collection is perhaps all the more important in that a rather pedestrian collection of Bible expositions, probably tailored to fulfil the obligations of parish clergy as prescribed in the *Admonitio generalis*, during the course of time becomes authoritative enough that its readings are esteemed as on par with the works of renowned patristic and early medieval authors for use in the night office.

Lacking a known author and origin, HA has not been deemed worthy of a full edition yet, which has made the identification of citations and manuscript witnesses difficult in the

---

[18] Rudolf, "Bamberg," 25.

[19] This identification was made by Astrid Marner during a project on homiletic books in Norway 1050–1550 (for a description of the project see: https://www.uib.no/node/73418/homiliar-og-homilieb%C3%B8ker-i-noreg-ca-1050-1550 (accessed 2019 March 1), as part of the "From fragments to book history" project led by Åslaug Ommundsen (http://fragment.uib.no/ [accessed 2019 July 20]). The lectionary, sometimes referred to as the Emerald Lectionary due to the pieces by Smaragdus, comprises fragments Oslo, Riksarkivet (NRA), Lat. fragm. 706 (2–12) and 714 (1, 2, 3).

past.[20] In turn, it is mandatory for any editor to reach clarity on the earliest transmission before the task of editing can reasonably be undertaken. We are therefore happy to bring to notice the aforementioned new textual witnesses from the ninth and early tenth centuries, which are discussed below.

L2 X_{An} – Angers, BM 55, flyleaf s.n. (s. ix/x)[21]

A version of HA 14 (Fourth Sunday in Lent) appears on the second of two unnumbered flyleaves (c. 260 × 180mm) at the beginning of this manuscript, whose main text, the *Interpretatio evangeliorum* by "Epiphanius latinus" (CPL 914), has been localised in Western France and dated to the last third of the ninth century.[22] The homily, written in an insecure hand and without any ruling as one text-block, may be contemporary with the rest of the manuscript or a slightly later addition on the empty folio, occupying twenty-five lines on the recto and fifteen lines on the verso side.[23] Three folios may have been cut out between this leaf and the previous remaining flyleaf, which contains part of a Life of Saint Christopher

[20] A complete transcript of MS **O** is available in Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 228–346. A first edition of HA is currently in progress under the aegis of Aidan Conti at the University of Bergen.

[21] A digital facsimile can be found at https://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr/mirador/index.php?manifest=https://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr/iiif/20370/manifest. Accessed 2019 July 23.

[22] Étaix, "Angers," 151; Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 52. Bischoff's identification of the text as Pseudo-Chrysostom's *Homiliae in evangelia* is incorrect. For the correct identification and a recent description of the manuscript see Lukas Dorfbauer, "Die *Interpretatio Evangeliorum* des 'Epiphanius latinus' (*CPL* 914) und ihr Verhältnis zum Evangelienkommentar Fortunatians von Aquileia," *Revue d'études augustiniennes* 61 (2015), 73. For a transcript of HA 14 see Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 238–39.

[23] *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, 31:207: "fragment de sermon (IX^{e} ou X^{e} siècle)." Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 52: "in formloser Min."

(similar to BHL 1766), but whether these held the ending of this text or further HA homilies remains unknown.[24] The text of HA 14 is densely written, reminiscent of the *scriptio continua* of earlier centuries with capitals following simple punctus. The **a** is straight-backed as a rule, occurring in cc-shape only once (*tantos*, r/6); the head of the 3-shaped, bowed **g** is often left open (*genus*, r/21), the **ct**-ligature is tight (*facturus*, r/8), and the clubbing of ascenders sometimes not very prominent. Notable spellings that may point towards a French origin of the scribe can be found in *duocim* (v/1–2), *erbam* (r/15), and *fracmenta* (r/18).[25] The abbreviation **ƀ** = *bene* in *benedixit* (r/13) seems rare and conspicuous; Bischoff records it only in Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. Q. 33, fols. 62r–174r, a manuscript which he dates to s. ix$^{3/3}$ and localises in Western France, with partial influence from Tours.[26] In sum, it is possible that this specimen from HA originated in Western France, but it may not be considered evidence for a coincidental aptness of Étaix's designation with regard to the origin of the collection.

Surprisingly, the header of the text assigns the pericope of John 6:5–14 (*Cum subleuasset oculos* ...) to Matthew, which could indicate that the piece was excerpted from a collection and then titled wrongly. Étaix's "base-text" of **A** shows only few textual deviations from this version of HA 14. Crucially, however, it differs in its quotation of the pericopal sentence of John 6:1 (*Abiit iesus trans mare galilee* ...), which is lacking in other HA manuscripts. Valuable evidence for the potential textual fluidity of the preaching addresses of HA comes from an addition at the end of the text, where the main hand adds the exegetical

[24] Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 51. For the Life of Christopher see *Acta Sanctorum*, Julii VI, 146–49.

[25] Peter Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, 5 vols. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.5 (Munich, 1996–2004), VII, §§ 118–21, 177.8. On the syncope or potential haplology of *duocim* see ibid. VII, § 298.3.

[26] Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 2217.

sentence "Ita et ecclesia duo habet testamenta, in qua christus ostenditur; et per duo testamenta gubernatur ecclesia" (The church also has two testaments through which Christ shows himself; and through two testaments the church is ruled),[27] to be inserted via *signe-de-renvoi* after *conparantur* (v/1).

L2 f_E – Épinal, BM 161 (74), fol. 139rv (s. ix$^{3/3}$)

The Épinal fragment, like the other witnesses discussed here, represents an important aid to localizing the origins of the HA collection and, as the potentially earliest known witness to date, it may prove crucial for the establishment of a critical edition. The fragment is found in a ninth-century manuscript once kept in the abbey of Moyenmoutier containing texts by Sedulius, Juvencus, Adrevald of Fleury, and others, and it contains parts of homilies HA 28, 29, and 30 (Fourth to Sixth Sundays after Pentecost).[28] Currently numbered as folio 139 of the present manuscript, the leaf was cut over the fold from what initially represented a bifolium. It was then trimmed and turned to fit the size of the present manuscript as a pastedown or flyleaf. As a result, the text of HA, written in a single column, runs perpendicular to the normally horizontal running text, from top to bottom rather than left to right. Moreover, the bifolium has been cut in such a way that the present folio includes text from all four sides of the original bifolium, whose single folios must have exceeded 230 × 170mm. There is a large

[27] Translations, unless otherwise indicated, are our own.

[28] Bischoff, *Katalog*, nos. 1170 and 1171. For the main part of the manuscript see also *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, 3:430; Carl P. E. Springer, *The Manuscripts of Sedulius: A Provisional Handlist*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 85.5 (Philadelphia, 1995), p. 49. For available transcripts of manuscript versions of these homilies see Étaix, "Angers," 182–83 (HA 29); Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 276–77 (HA 28). Rudolf, "Bamberg," 38–39 (HA 28 and 29). A digital facsimile of Épinal BM 161 can be found at the library's website, https://galeries.limedia.fr/ark:/18128/d8f6fzb6f0qn8dhq/p6. Accessed 2019 November 12.

block of text above the previous fold at the top of both 139r and 139v, and then smaller blocks of text—the beginnings of lines on 139r and the ends of lines on 139v—below the fold on both sides. Consequently, with regards to the text of HA found on the former bifolium, the reading begins with the large block on the upper portion of 139v which contains HA 28. HA 28 then continues and ends on the block of text that makes up the upper portion of 139r, after which HA 29 begins. HA 29 continues and ends on the lower portion of folio 139r, after which HA 30 begins. HA 30 then continues on the lower portion of 139v. An almost undamaged flyleaf written in the same hand and potentially taken from the same original carrier codex can be found as fol. 1. It contains the ending of Augustine's *Sermo* 369 (On the Nativity, 1r–v) and the beginning of *Sermo* 151 of Peter Chrysologus (On the Flight into Egypt, 1v).[29] The leaf suggests that fol. 139 could have had a ruled range of twenty-five lines per page.

Wear marks that run horizontally towards the bottom of folio 139r suggest rubbing from the string used to bind the quires of the volume from which the bifolium originated. The string from the original binding was run inside this bifolium. This fact and the sequence and continuations of the text of HA confirm that folio 139 was once part of the innermost bifolium of a quire whose size remains unknown.

For the sake of presenting the text in the sequence in which it was originally compiled, we have labelled the text above the fold on 139v as A; the text above the now-horizontal fold on 139r as B; the text below the fold on 139r as C; and the small amount of text below the now-horizontal fold on 139v as D.[30]

[INSERT Figure 1 here]

[29] See PL 39:1655–57 and PL 52:602–4.

[30] See also the manuscript plates below.

Fig. 1: Vertical Text Distribution on fol. 139 of Épinal, BM 161

The fragment shows the work of one scribe of the late ninth century.[31] A title, perhaps reading "Secundum Luca*m*. In illo tempore.," and an initial have been added in red. Ascenders of the quite regular main hand are clubbed, while descenders tend to be pointed. The **a** often shows a gap between back and belly (*habere*, B14); a single instance of cc-shaped **a** (*sapientia*, A11) can be found; the **e** is prominently horned, usually with an open head and marked tongue when found in end position (*occidere*, B15), with one instance of a raised, 3-shaped **e** in ligature (*condempnet*, B12); **g** occasionally has a slight opening (*gregorius*, A15); **ct-** and **st-** ligatures are tight and high. Sentences are segregated by punctus or punctus versus, the latter showing a remarkable triple point on top. Some abbreviations are remarkable; the rarer ones among them are often connected with manuscripts from the North and Northeast of France by Bischoff, such as *eccl*a*s* = *eccl*esi*as* (D12, East), *misc*d*a* = *mis*ericor*dia*m (B18, North), *nr*t = *nos*t*er* (B13, probably Northeast), *nr*o*s* = *n*ost*ros* (B17, Lorraine) and *ur*t = *uester* (B10, probably Northeast).[32] This seems to be the most plausible region for a potential origin.

Épinal being the earliest witness of the collection known to date, we offer a facsimile and a transcription of the text in the order of the items following the *Temporale* of HA.

[PLACE Photograph 1 HERE AS FULL PAGE]

Plate 1: Épinal, BM 161 (74), fol. 139r. © Épinal, Bibliothèque municipale 2019.

[31] See Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 1170, who dates it to s. ix^{2}, and Rudolf, "Bamberg," 40 for Dorfbauer's dating of s. ix$^{3/3}$.

[32] See Bischoff, *Katalog*, nos. 789, 2153, 3982, 4827, 4987.

[PLACE Photograph 2 HERE AS FULL PAGE]

Plate 2: Épinal, BM 161 (74), fol. 139v. © Épinal, Bibliothèque municipale 2019.

L3 Transcript of Épinal, Bibliothèque Municipale 161 (74), fol. 139

A fol. 139v, text above horizontal fold line.

HA 28 (Fourth Sunday after Pentecost), beginning approximately halfway through the exposition, seemingly with the part that explains *amicos et vicinos* (Luke 15:6)

1. dic[.....]
2. pectu[.....]
3. tissi[.....(-)]
4. ab[.....] et de uno(-)
5. [.....] ad bona(-)
6. [.....] uctu[os]a[m] [....] [ga]udiu*m*
7. [.....] qui non faciunt poeni(-)
8. [...]ia[.]q[...]a[.]g[.....]non e*st* necessitas agere poe(-)
9. [....]ntia*m* quia mundi sunt et sine macula. SEq*uitur*; Aut
10. que mulier habens dragmas dece*m*; Ista mulier intel(-)
11. legit*ur* sapientia quod e*st* d*omi*n*us* n*oste*r; Decem dragmas.- noue*m* or(-)
12. dines angelor*um* sunt. et in decima dragma. Imago d*e*i
13. exprimitur q*uo*d e*st* adam et genus humanu*m* qui in per(-)
14. ditione fuer*unt*; Sicut supra diximus istos noue*m* ordi(-)
15. nes nominauit gregorius in omelia sua ; Id s*unt* angeli
16. archangeli uirtutes potestates principatus domina(-)

17. tiones throni cherubin atq*ue* seraphim et in illo decimo
18. loco unde primus angelus p*er* sua sup*er*bia cecidit in p*er*di(-)
19. tione restauraut[33] homines fideles. Ac si ap*er*ta dicat;
20. Accendit lucerna[m]. Ista lucerna Chr*istu*s e*st*. qui e*st* lux
21. uera et inluminauit mundu*m* qui e[ra]t t[e]nebr\o/sus;
22. Und[e a]dditur. Conuocat amicos et uicinos. ipsi s*unt*
23. angeli et archangeli. [quod] [supe]rius dixim*us* qui [repl(-)]

B fol. 139r, text above horizontal fold line.

The end of HA 28 (Fourth Sunday after Pentecost); the beginning of HA 29 (Fifth Sunday after Pentecost)

1. [.....Agit]e nunc
2. [.....]ia ani(-)
3. ma et[.....] ut ille nos dignet reportare In
4. uita sua [...] gl*ori*a et*er*na*m* AMEN. [**SECUNDUM LUCAM**?]
5. [**In illo tempore**]. Dixit ie*su*s discipulis suis. Estote mise(-)
6. ricordes sicut et pater \u*este*r/ misericors e*st*. et cetera.
7. **A**udistis fr*atre*s k*arissi*mi in lectione euuangelica quale*m* mise(-)
8. ricordia*m* d*omi*nu*s* n*oste*r dixit discipulis suis et nobis omnib*us*
9. habere. Ait; Estote misericordes quomodo sicut
10. pater u*este*r misericor[34] est; Nos fr*atre*s cotidie peccam*us*
11. contra in multis modis; Ille nos non occidit non sper(-)
12. nit. non condempnet .- sed semp*er* nos expectat ut nos

[33] *Sic*, ut vid.

[34] *Sic*.

13. emendemus in melius et q*uo*d peius est si frat*er* no*ste*r peccat
14. contra nos . nulla*m* mis*eri*c*or*dia*m* uolumus habere contra
15. illum; Aliquando uolunt occidere; Aliquando con(-)
16. dempnare aliquando in poena*m* mittere; Considere(-)
17. mus fr*atre*s k*arissi*mi agite misericordia contra fr*atre*s n*ost*ros sicut
18. pater u*este*r caelestis habet mis*eri*c*or*d*iam* contra uos; Nolite iudi(-)
19. care et non iudicabimini. id e*st* nolite iudicare ad per(-)
20. dictione*m* mortis ne uos in sp*irit*u iuditii habeatis ante
21. tribunal iudicis; Nolite condempnare et non con(-)
22. dempnabimini; Timete fr*atre*s k*arissi*mi in malum iudicium
23. [.....super nos ipsu*m*] iudicium et ipsa condemp(-)

C fol. 139r, text running below the horizontal fold line

Continuation of HA 29 (Fifth Sunday after Pentecost); beginning of HA 30 (Sixth Sunday after Pentecost)

1. [.....]
2. in ma[licia.....]
3. p*er*fectus [est.....ho(-)]
4. mo qui ex[emplum.....proximo]
5. suo sicut i[lle.....dicat]
6. q*u*id aut*em* u[ides.....]
7. in oculo tu[o.....]
8. minora pe[ccata.....ma(-)]
9. lignu*m* . ta[les.....pec(-)]
10. cata in fr[atris..... non]

11. considera[nt.....id est]
12. uani et in[fructuosi.....minima]
13. peccata [semetipsos.....pro(-)]
14. xima pe[ccata.....et ipsos]
15. eicite tr[abem.....]
16. uos sciti[s.....fes(-)]
17. tucam d[e.....ne]
18. in mai[ora.....bona]
19. opera et [uera.....fa(-)]
20. cit et se[metipsum.....]
21. LEC*TIO* SE[CUNDUM LUCAM?.....]
22. IN ILLO [TEMPORE.....]
23. ut audi[rent.....]

D fol. 139v, text running below the horizontal fold line

Continuation of HA 30 (Sixth Sunday after Pentecost)

1. [.....ibidem] fuit
2. [beatus petrus.....exi] a me
3. [domine.....ti]mere
4. [ex hoc.....] beatus pe(-)
5. [trus.....] mod[um] fecit
6. [.....and]rea*m* [...]
7. [.....] o[mni]a(?)
8. [.....] se[cut?]ti sunt
9. [.....] audi(-)

10. [uimus.....]ere mu(-)
11. [ndum.....] Ad sensu*m*
12. [.....] eccl*esi*as; Ille
13. [.....discipu]li petrus.
14. [.....quatt]or funda(-)
15. [menta.....obedie]ns. debet
16. [..... inter]pretatur
17. [.....o]mnipoten(-)
18. [tem.....interpreta]t*ur* decorus
19. [.....ca]stos. et for(-)
20. [tes.....i]nterpretat*ur*
21. [.....be]nedicere.
22. [.....] subplantare
23. [.....]m

The top of column B (folio 139r) contains the concluding imperatives of HA 28. Several manuscripts (**Be, Ma, T**) read, with some variation:[35] "Agite nunc penitentiam et conuertimini ad dominum deum uestrum ex toto corde ut ille nos reportare dignetur in uita sua id est in gloria aeterna." (Do penance now and turn to the Lord, your God, with all your heart so that he deems it worthy to bring us back to his life, that is into eternal glory). The word *nunc* is clearly visible at the top of the column in the Épinal manuscript. The small **e** before the word suggests that *agite* preceded. Similarly, at the end of the third line *reportare* seems to be visible as are letters for *in* and then on the next line *uita sua* and *gloria aeterna*. But there is

[35] See Étaix "Angers," 153 under item 28 for the other manuscripts that contain this homily; to these can be added the copy in Bodley 343 edited in Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 276–77.

too much space for the manuscript to have reported simply "conuertimini ad dominum deum uestrum ex toto corde ut" (turn to the Lord, our God, with your whole heart so that) and the letters that can be read in the space suggest that *anima* was also part of the formulation. Lacking better tools at present, we can cautiously propose that the Épinal fragment offered a small expansion within the concluding imperatives for this homily.

L2 X_{Or} – Orléans, BM 149, pp. 38–72 (s. ix/x)

The manuscript is composed of two originally separate volumes, only the first of which (pp. 1–94, 181 × 125mm) directly concerns us here.[36] The main text of this volume, apparently written at Fleury in the second half of the ninth century, is Ambrose's *De bono mortis* (CPL 129), which ends at the top of p. 94, after which another hand has written out Revelation 6:12–16. Several verses from Proverbs were added in this same hand to the previously blank p. 1.[37] But this manuscript is more interesting for what its margins contain: an archive of biblical quotations, homilies, prayers, and other texts. These marginal texts were dated to the tenth century by Bischoff, but more recently Pellegrin and Bouhot have suggested the slightly earlier date of s. ix/x.[38] The texts were written mainly in a single hand, probably the same hand responsible for the addition of the verses from Proverbs and Revelation at the beginning and end of the volume. Pellegrin and Bouhot note the presence of some of these additions in their recent catalogue of Orléans manuscripts. They suggest that the additions might be the work of students, presumably because, as they say, the writing is unskilled and the marginal

[36] Élisabeth Pellegrin and Jean-Paul Bouhot, *Catalogue des manuscrits médiévaux de la bibliothèque municipale d'Orléans,* Documents, etudes et repertoires 78 (Paris, 2010), pp. 159–62; Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 3694.

[37] Pellegrin and Bouhot (*Catalogue*, p. 160) date the additions on p. I to the eleventh century and those on p. 94 to the ninth or tenth, but they are clearly the work of the same scribe.

[38] Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 3695; Pellegrin and Bouhot, *Catalogue*, p. 160.

texts contain "grossières fautes d'orthographie."[39] We can only speculate about who may have been responsible for inserting the additions, but their content suggests that they were collected and written down for practical, pastoral purposes, perhaps by or for a priest who owned or frequently used the volume. In this way, **X$_{Or}$** is analogous to a well-known early English manuscript, CCCC 41, a copy of the Old English Bede into whose margins have been inserted various liturgical texts, homilies, charms, and poems. A similar combination of preaching texts with charms in non-marginal transmission occurs in the small-sized Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 85/86, which may have been used by a priest.[40]

Most of the material added to **X$_{Or}$** was later partially or fully erased, and on many pages it is difficult to determine what, if anything, the margins once held. In the account of the manuscript's marginal contents that follows, we only attempt to describe material that is at least partly legible in the digital images of the manuscript available on the website of the Bibliothèque municipale d'Orléans.[41] Ultraviolet photography or multispectral analysis of **X$_{Or}$** would likely make possible the identification of more texts.

L3 Legible Contents of the Margins

[39] Pellegrin and Bouhot, *Catalogue*, p. 160.

[40] For the contents of these manuscripts see Ker, *Catalogue*, nos. 32 and 336. On CCCC 41 and its additions see esp. Thomas A. Bredehoft, "Filling the Margins of CCCC 41: Textual Space and a Developing Archive," *RES* n.s. 57 (2006), 721–32. For the use of Junius 85/86 as a priest's book see Jonathan Wilcox, "The Use of Ælfric's Homilies: MSS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 85 and 86 in the Field," in *A Companion to Ælfric,* ed. Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 18 (Leiden, 2009), pp. 345–68; and Gerald P. Dyson, *Priests and Their Books in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 34 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2019), pp. 136–42.

[41] http://aurelia.orleans.fr. Accessed 2019 November 12.

1. (p. 27, outer margins): The margins have been erased, but traces of Proverbs 18:13 and 3:28–29 are identifiable in the left and lower margins, respectively. The rest of the erased text probably contained more quotations from Proverbs, and potentially other biblical books as well (see item 11 below). The extracts seem to have continued onto p. 28 (more thoroughly erased than p. 27), and possibly further.

2. (p. 31, left margin): A calendar for the month of October, noted by Pellegrin and Bouhot; unerased. More calendrical material seems to have preceded this excerpt in the right margin of p. 30 and to have followed in the margins of at least pp. 32 and 33, but these have all been erased.

3. (p. 36, right margin): "Apropinquante Iesu filio dei Ierusolyman pueri hebr…." The beginning of a Palm Sunday antiphon (see René-Jean Hesbert, *Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex* [Rome, 2010], no. 213A); unerased.

4. (p. 38, lower margin): "Septima fumus. Agit nuc [*sic*]." A fragment of the Seven Pains of Hell motif, probably ultimately derived from a version of the *Visio Pauli* but here resembling a passage in HA 22 (Rogationtide; Étaix, "Angers," 179–80; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 264–65; Rudolf, "Bamberg," 31–33). On the use of this passage from HA 22 in two Old English homilies, see Stephen Pelle, "The Seven Pains of Hell." The rest of the marginal material is too thoroughly erased to tell if more of HA 22 was once present on p. 38 and the nearby pages.

5. (p. 39, upper, left, and lower margins and p. 40, upper and right margins): HA 53 (Twenty-Fifth Sunday after Pentecost; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 312–13), apparently complete; erased, but traces remain legible.

6. (pp. 40–45, outer margins): HA 40 (Thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost; Étaix, "Angers," 183–84; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 291–94; Rudolf, "The Homiliary of Angers," 190), apparently complete; erased, but traces remain legible.

7. (pp. 46–47, outer margins): HA 50 (Twenty-Second Sunday after Pentecost; Étaix, "Angers," 186–87; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 307–9), apparently complete; erased, but traces remain legible.

8. (pp. 48–50, outer margins): HA 29 (Fourth Sunday after Pentecost; Étaix, "Angers," 182–83; Rudolf, "Bamberg," 39; Gretsch, "The Taunton Fragment," 151–53), complete; much of p. 48 and all of p. 49 unerased. Pellegrin and Bouhot describe the marginal contents of pp. 48–55 simply as "[f]ragments de sermons."

9. (pp. 50 bis–54, outer margins): HA 15 (Passion Sunday; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 242–45); complete; unerased except for conclusion in upper margin of p. 54.

10. (pp. 54–55, outer margins): excerpts from Gregory's *Homiliae in evangelia* (CPL 1711; ed. in CCSL 141) 5, 10, 17, and possibly others; p. 54 erased, most of p. 55 unerased.

11. (pp. 56, outer margins and p. 57, upper and right margins): Tob. 4:6–11 [Vetus Latina]; Prov. 17:17, 17:24, 17:28, 19:12, 19:21, 20:1, 20:20; unerased. Described by Pellegrin and Bouhot as "[s]entences morales."

12. (p. 57, lower margin, pp. 58 and 59, outer margins, pp. 64 and 65, lower margin, p. 66, outer margins, p. 67, upper and right margins): Pseudo-Isidore, *Sermo* 3 (CPPM I, 5306; PL 83:1223–25) – inc.: "Satis nos oportet timere tres causas …"; expl.: "Tu iaci<s> in immo puluere et ego crucior in <in>fernum." No significant portions of the text have been erased, though trimming of the outer margins has resulted in the loss of some letters. Misidentified by Pellegrin and Bouhot as the (admittedly very similar) Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 68 *Ad fratres in eremo* (CPPM I, 1195; PL 40:1354–55). On the influence of the Pseudo-Isidorian and Pseudo-Augustinian texts on the eschatology of the Old English homilies, see P. S. Langeslag, "Kinsmen before Christ, Parts I and II," *LSE* 45 n.s. (2014), 34–48 and 46 (2015), 1–18. It is perhaps significant that Pseudo-Isidore *Sermo* 3 is also found in manuscript **A** (see Étaix, "Angers," 160).

13. (p. 60, upper and lower margins, p. 61, outer margins): erased and mostly illegible, but fragments of two biblical quotations—Acts 14:21 and Matthew 16:28—can be discerned.

14. (pp. 62 and 63, outer margins, p. 64, upper and left margins, p. 65, upper and right margins, p. 67, lower margin, pp. 68 and 69, outer margins): A Pseudo-Augustinian sermon for Palm Sunday, CPPM I, 3307. This is the earliest copy so far identified of this unedited and apparently rare text, which is known to survive in only two other manuscripts, Paris, BnF, lat. 2628 (s. xi) and Mantua, Biblioteca comunale 134 (A. V. 4) (s. xiii$^{1/4}$), on which see, respectively, Germain Morin, ed., *Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis Sermones*, CCSL 103–4 (Turnhout, 1953), pp. xcix–c; and Corrado Corradini, Paolo Golinelli, and Giuseppa Z. Zanichelli, *Catalogo dei manoscritti*

polironiani: Biblioteca comunale di Mantova, MSS 1–100 (Bologna, 1998), pp. 114–31, at p. 129 (items 218 and 219).[42] The margins of p. 62 of $\mathbf{X_{Or}}$ are erased and those of p. 63 partially erased, but the marginal writing on pp. 64, 65, and 67–69 is preserved and generally legible, though often hard to interpret because of copying errors and the scribe's heavily vulgarized language. The sermon apparently ended in the upper margin of p. 70, which has been thoroughly erased.

Only in the Paris manuscript is the Palm Sunday sermon ascribed to Augustine. The text is notable for containing numerous dramatic eschatological passages, including an address of Christ to the damned on Doomsday, similar in some ways to the *Ego te, homo* speech derived from Caesarius of Arles and popular among the Old English anonymous homilists (see Bazire-Cross, pp. 126 and 129):

> Quid dicetis in die iudicii quando ipse dominus Christus habet uobis monstrare fixuras clauorum in manus suas et in pedes suos, et habet uobis dicere: "Ecce quantam penuriam et tormenta pro uobis passus sum ego dominus deus uester sine ulla culpa, sine ullo pecato. Modo dicite mihi quid boni propter hoc dum in seculo corporaliter fuistis mihi reddidistis aut fecistis. Quare magis diaboli suggestioni quam meo praecepto oboedistis? Habuistis praedicatores et diuersos doctores qui de

[42] Digital images of the Paris manuscript provided by the Bibliothèque nationale. The Mantua manuscript can be viewed online at http://digilib.bibliotecateresiana.it/sfoglia_manoscritti2.php?g=Manoscritti%20serie%20generale&sg=Ms.%20134&identifier=MN0035-POLI-ms134_0. Accessed 2019 November 30.

> passione quam pro uobis sustinui dixerunt et praedicauerunt. Quare illis non credidistis?"[43] (Paris, BnF, lat. 2628, fols. 115v–16r)

Another passage—in which the audience is reminded that they will have neither silver nor gold nor any other riches to present to God on Doomsday, but only their souls—is reminiscent of an Insular eschatological motif described by Charles D. Wright, "The Pledge of the Soul: A Judgment Theme in Old English Homiletic Literature and Cynewulf's *Elene*," *NM* 91 (1990), 23–30:

> Sic et omnis homo debet esse arbor fructuosa et fructus bonos, id est bona opera, facere, ut illos possit in diem iudicii Christo domino praesentare. Non habetis uobiscum ibi nec aurum nec argentum nec pretiosas uestes siue pallia portare, ut inde munera offeratis deo, sed tantum animas uestras habetis illi praesentare.[44] (Paris, BnF, lat. 2628, fol. 114r)

The Orléans marginal scribe is not the only user of HA who had to be creative in his choice of a Palm Sunday homily. Since HA has no homilies for Palm Sunday or

[43] "What will you say on the Day of Judgement, when Christ the Lord himself will show you the holes from the nails in his hands and in his feet, and say to you: 'Look how great were the difficulties and torments that I suffered for your sake—I, the Lord your God, without any blame and without any sin. Now tell me what good you have given back or done in return for this while you lived in the body in the world. Why were you more obedient to the devil's suggestion than to my command? You had preachers and various teachers who spoke and preached about the suffering that I endured for you. Why did you not believe them?'"

[44] "Likewise, every person should be a fruitful tree and make good fruit, that is good works, so that he may present them to Christ the Lord on the Day of Judgement. There you will carry with you neither gold nor silver nor expensive garments or cloaks from which to offer gifts to God, but you will present to him only your souls."

the Triduum, several manuscripts of the collection, including **A**, are augmented with Holy Week texts taken from other sources (see Étaix, "Angers," 158–59 and 161; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 147–212).

15. (p. 71, outer margins, p. 72, upper and left margins): HA 25 (Pentecost; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 268–69; Rudolf, "Bamberg," 36); p. 71 erased, p. 72 unerased.

16. (p. 76, left margin): "Benedicam dominum," partially erased, in a later hand than the other marginal additions (s. xii?).

17. (p. 78, upper and left margins): Prov. 25:23, 25:25, 26:1, 26:4, 26:18, 26:21; unerased. The verses do not continue onto p. 79, as Pellegrin and Bouhot claim. See next entry.

18. (p. 78, lower margin, pp. 79–81, outer margins): comments on a number of Psalm verses (at least 9:6, 9:16–17, 9:27, 9:30–31, 9:35, 17:16–17, 17:20, 18:6, and 143:6); unerased except for lower margin of p. 81. In many cases the wording approaches that of the early seventh-century *Anonymi Glosa Psalmorum ex traditione seniorum* (CPL 1167c; Helmut Boese, ed., *Vetus Latina: die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel vols 22 and 25* [1992, 1994]) and the related *Breviarium in Psalmos* (CPL 629; PL 26:821–1278; see Martin McNamara, *The Psalms in the Early Irish Church* [Sheffield, 2000], pp. 306–8).

19. (p. 82, lower margin): a charm to staunch bleeding, unerased. Transcribed by Pellegrin and Bouhot, who claim that part of the text is written in "langue vulgaire." The relevant passage is transcribed as follows: "leva sol a contra geor et luna leva cor me

salvator." The manuscript in fact reads "leua sol de contra geor et luna leua cosme [= *cosmi*] saluator," nearly all of which can be interpreted as Latin forms, even if the meaning of the passage as a whole remains difficult to decipher. The problematic word "geor" perhaps refers to the spring of Jor, one of the supposed sources (along with a spring called Dan) of the Jordan River (see, e.g., Isidore's *Etymologiae* 13.21.18), which plays a role later in the charm.

20. (pp. 84–86, outer margins): Job 1:2–3; Prov. 27:6, 26:8, 25:18, 25:15–16, 19:6, 12:9, 12:11, 10:16; Isa. 1:4–6, 13–14, 11–12, 14–15, 20; unerased; noted by Pellegrin and Bouhot.

21. (p. 88, lower margin, upside-down): "In nomine domini sanctus et inegui… [?]"; unerased.

22. (p. 89, right margin): "Miserere mei deus" (Ps. 50:3); apparently partly erased.

23. (p. 89, lower margin, upside-down): "<S>umme trinitati sinplici deo, una diuinitas equalis glorie, coeterna magestas patri prolique santoque flamini" (see Hesbert, *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii*, no. 7718).

24. (p. 92, lower margin, upside-down): "Isti sunt sant…" followed by several erased words.

In total, then, the margins of $\mathbf{X_{Or}}$ bear witness to at least seven texts from HA (15, 22, 25, 29, 40, 50, 53), interspersed out of temporal order with other material that might have been thought useful for pastoral care in the early Middle Ages.

The hand responsible for the HA pieces in the margins of $\mathbf{X_{Or}}$ is slightly edgy and unsteady in its size and ductus; ascenders vary between slim, clubbed, wedged, and T-topped (*diligit*, 56/26); descenders tend towards pointing. The back of the **a** leans far to the left (*gloriam,* 48/32); **d** is usually arcing and round-backed (*iudicium,* 48/28), less often straight (*deus*, 48/30); **e**, with open head at the back, leans to the right (*mortem*, 51/32); **g** is inconsistent, varying between Insular-style flat top (*gloria*, 51/28), 3-shape (*angelos*, 53/2), and slightly, but always open headed forms (*gulam*, 57/19); **f** descends notably (*festam*, 49/8–9); **s** descends below the base line (*suis*, 49/19); **t** often shows a tightly-curved stem (*nolunt*, 49/24); the **ct**-ligature is tight (*iactatis*, 68/31). The marginalia seem to lack any titles and apart from a very inconsistent punctus there is hardly any punctuation to be found. The dropping of **h** before vowels is typical: *abitacionem* (68/29); *onorem* (48/32); *omo* (67/26).[45] The general inconsistency makes it difficult to localise the scribe, but the Fleury origin and Orléans provenance could suggest a product of Fleury or the Loire region.[46]

L2 X_P – Paris, BnF, lat. 13768, fols. 61r–71v (s. x^1)

Folios 25r–84v of this manuscript (about 175 × 145mm) contain a number of homiletic texts copied in the first half of the tenth-century.[47] The two other parts of which this manuscript is composed (fols. 1r–4v and 5r–24v) were copied in the twelfth century; at least the second of these sections comes from Corbie,[48] but the origin of fols. 25r–84v is uncertain. What little

[45] Stotz, *Handbuch*, 3.VII:§§118–21.

[46] We are grateful to Professor David Ganz who confirmed a potential Fleury origin to us in a written communication.

[47] Microfilm scans available through Gallica: https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b100367869.r=13768?rk=21459;2. Accessed 2019 November 17.

[48] See the description of fols. 5r–24v on the website of the MANNO project, http://saprat.ephe.sorbonne.fr/media/7dcfb058f4df5470ead1770bbecc01de/latin-13768.pdf. Accessed 2019

attention this last part of the manuscript has attracted has been due to its preservation of texts from a Hiberno-Latin homiliary, the *Catechesis Cracoviensis*, so called because its earliest and best-known manuscript is now in Kraków.[49] It has not, to our knowledge, been recognised until now that **X$_P$** is also an early witness to HA.[50] A full description of the contents of fols. 25r–84v follows. Item numbers for the *Catechesis Cracoviensis* (henceforth *Cat.Crac.*), follow Amos, "The *Catechesis Cracoviensis*," 78–86; see also Amos, "The Origin and Nature," pp. 382–89.

1. (25r–31v): *Cat.Crac.* 7 (unedited[51]) – inc.: "Lucas euangelista cummemorat de ista lectione de Octouiano Agusto …"; expl.: "… dabit illis hic in presenti adiutorium et plus dabit in futuro in uitam aeternam in secula seculorum, amen."

November 22; Lieven van Acker, "Ein vorläufiges Verzeichnis der Gedichte des Petrus Pictor," *MJ* 5 (1968), 304.

[49] Raymond Étaix, "Un manuel de pastorale de l'époque carolingienne (Clm 27152)," *RB* 91 (1981), 126, n. 4; Frederick M. Biggs, "The Fourfold Division of Souls: The Old English 'Christ III' and the Insular Homiletic Tradition," *Traditio* 45 (1990), 37, n. 9; Thomas L. Amos, "The Origin and Nature of the Carolingian Sermon" (Ph.D. diss., Michigan State, 1983), pp. 379–89. See also Thomas L. Amos, "The *Catechesis Cracoviensis* and Hiberno-Latin Exegesis on the *Pater Noster*," *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 13 (1990), 77–107. On the relevance of the collection to Old English homilies, see Charles D. Wright, "Hiberno-Latin and Irish-Influenced Biblical Commentaries, Florilegia, and Homily Collections," in *SASLC*: *A Trial Version*, pp. 118–19. The Kraków manuscript has been edited, without consideration of variant readings from the other manuscripts of the collection, in Brygida Kürbis, Jerzy Wolny, and Danuta Zydorek, eds., *Kazania na różne dni postne i inne teksty z kodeksu krakowskiego 140 (43)*, Monumenta Sacra Polonorum 4 (Kraków, 2010).

[50] Amos ("The Origin and Nature," p. 381) described the HA texts, accurately if not exactly, as "eleven short Carolingian sermons."

[51] Stephen Pelle is currently producing an edition of this text.

2. (31v–36r): *Cat.Crac.* 4 (Kürbis et al., *Kazania*, pp. 157–61) – inc.: "*Et quidem baptizo uos in aqua* (Luke 3:16) …. Qu<id> suscitauit istum sermonem ad Iohannem? …"; expl.: "… congregate amicos meos et electos in rgno [*sic*] caelorum ubi regnabunt sine fine in seculo [*sic*] seculorum, amen."

3. (36r–41r): *Cat.Crac.* 8 (Kürbis et al., *Kazania*, pp. 162–66) – inc.: "VIII DE EPHIPHANIA. Matheus euangelista cummemorat de magis qui uenerunt ab oriente …"; expl.: "Si nos offeramus ei ista trea que diximus, ipse reddat nobis mercedem in futuro in uitam aeternam in secula seculorum, amen."

4. (41r–45v): *Cat.Crac.* 11 (Kürbis et al., *Kazania*, pp. 174–78) – inc. "DE APOSTOLO. *Videns autem Iesus turbis ascendit in montem* (Matt. 5:1) …. Dominus noster fuit grauatus ab illis turbis conuenientibus ad se …"; expl.: "… quando intrabunt cum fidutia cum domino suo in regnum caelorum ubi regnabunt sine fine."

5. (45v–51v): *Cat.Crac.* 17 (Kürbis et al., *Kazania*, pp. 200–5) – inc. "IN PALMIS. *Et cum adpropinquaret Iesus Hierosolimis et uenissent in Bethfage* (Matt. 21:1) …. Similiter Marcus dixit: *Et cum adpropinquaret* … (Mark 11:1) …"; expl.: "… sed colligat nos secum in regnum suum, ubi regnabunt cum illo in perpetua uita sine fine in secula seculorum."

6. (51v–55v): *Cat.Crac.* 18 (Kürbis et al., *Kazania*, pp. 205–8) – inc. "IN PASCHA DOMINI. Euuangelista cummemorat de resurrectione domini uidere sepulchrum uespere sabbati …"; expl. "… et colligat nos in regnum suum in uita aeterna in secula seculorum."

7. (55v–59v): *Cat.Crac.* 19 (Kürbis et al., *Kazania*, pp. 209–12) – inc. "Iohannis euuangelista commemorat de resurrectione domini et dixit quod Maria Magdalene [*sic*]"; expl.: "… et quicumque portauerunt signum crucis Christi in frontibus suis quasi in superliminaribus, hii erunt liberati in illo die et collecti in uita aeternam in secula seculorum, amen."

8. (59v–60v): *Cat.Crac.* 34 (unedited) – inc.: "PREDICATIO DOMINI IN MONTE. Dominus noster quando predicauit in montem coram discipulis et coram turbis laudauit illos lugentes …"; expl. "… quod per dilectionem carnis commissimus." Ending imperfect.

9. (61rv): HA 16 (First Sunday after Easter; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 256–58; Rudolf, "Bamberg," 26–27)

10. (61v–62v): HA 17 (Second Sunday after Easter; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 258–59; Rudolf, "Bamberg," 27–28)

11. (62v–63r): HA 18 (Third Sunday after Easter; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 259–60; Rudolf, "Bamberg," 28–30)

12. (63r–64v): HA 19 (Fourth Sunday after Easter; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 260–61; Rudolf, "Bamberg," 30–31)

13. (64v–65r): HA 20 (Fifth Sunday after Easter; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 261–62; Rudolf, "Bamberg," 31)

14. (65r–66v): HA 21 (*Pascha annotina*; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 270–71)

15. (66v–68r): HA 22 (Rogationtide; Étaix, "Angers," 179–80; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 264–65; Rudolf, "Bamberg," pp. 31–33)

16. (68r–69v): HA 23 (Ascension; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 266–67; Rudolf, "Bamberg," 35)

17. (69v–70r): HA 24 (Sunday after Ascension; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 267–68; Rudolf, "Bamberg" 35–36)

18. (70r–71r): HA 25 (Pentecost; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 268–69; Rudolf, "Bamberg," 36)

19. (71v): HA 26 (First Sunday after Pentecost; Étaix, "Angers," 180–82; Conti, "Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha," pp. 271–73; Rudolf, "Bamberg," 36–37); incomplete.

20. (72r–75r): *Cat.Crac.* 30 (unedited) – inc.: "Matheus euangelista scripsit in euangelio suo de isto homine qui peregre profectus est …"; expl.: "… et ipse contrarium dixit nolentibus flere sua pecata: *Ve uobis qui ridebitis* (Luke 6:25)." Text somewhat abbreviated.

21. (75r–79v): *Cat.Crac.* 24 (Kürbis et al., *Kazania*, pp. 231–35) – inc.: "*Intrantes per angustam porta quia lata porta et spatiosa uia que ducit a perditionem* (Matt. 7:13)

.... Dominus noster dixit apostolis suis et turbis, uidit angustam in cordibus eorum …"; expl.: "… non dubitamus postea que poterimus intrare per ianuam regni celestis et regnare cum uitam adque pepetua [*sic*] in secula seculorum, amen."

22. (79v–84r): *Cat.Crac.* 13 (unedited) – inc.: "*Et docebat eos dicens: Beati mites quoniam ipsi possidebunt terram* (Matt. 5:2, 5:4). Dominus noster laudabit mittes qui abent mansuetudinem et humilitatem …"; expl.: "… *non enim auditores legis iusti sunt apud deum, sed factores legis* (Rom. 2:13)." Ending imperfect.

It may be significant that the HA items in $\mathbf{X_P}$, which begin with the First Sunday after Easter, occur almost immediately after the Easter texts from *Cat.Crac.* However, it is possible that folios are missing between items 8 and 9, and more research will need to be conducted on the construction of the volume before any conclusions can be drawn from the present order of its contents.

There is a general similarity in the two (perhaps three) hands writing folios 25–84, and these scribes were probably trained in the same scriptorium. It is most likely that this section of the manuscript was conceived as a whole or at least bound together at an early stage. The part containing HA 16–26 (First Sunday after Easter to First Sunday after Pentecost, fols. 61r–71v) was written in one straight and somewhat edgy hand in one column of text. The **a** is upright and triangular (*bona*, 64/11); **d** is straight as a rule and like other ascenders shows a slight flagging to the left; a round-backed half-uncial **d** appears rarely, as in *id* (62v/1); descenders are not very pointed; **f** stands on the line; half-uncial **g** is flat-topped (*regnum*, 65r/1), perhaps evidence of an Insular substrate, with the tongue reaching to the left; **t** often has the foot flat on the base line; the **or**-ligature is common, the **st**-ligature tight (*pastor*, 62r/14); **p** often has a pointed, almost triangular belly (*lapidem*, 67r/13). Longer units end in punctus versus followed by capital; elsewhere simple punctus and punctus elevatus can be

found. Titles are written in a mixture of square and uncial capitals as well as minuscule. Spellings such as *peread* and *habead* (66r/12) show the softening of final **t** into **d**.[52] Despite the later Corbie provenance of the manuscript, it is difficult precisely to localise the potential Insular influence and angularity in this version of HA. It may have originated in a Northern French centre, perhaps even one in Brittany.

L2 Ramifications and Conclusions

The potentially earliest, albeit partial, presently identified witness to HA, the Épinal fragment, suggests that the collection was composed before the last third of the ninth century, which clearly predates Étaix's conjecture that the work was the product of a tenth-century pastor.[53] Unlike other early witnesses such as those in Orléans or $\mathbf{f_B}$ that show a number of non-standard or even vulgar forms, Épinal adheres to a relatively correct, but by no means grammatically perfect standard of Latin.[54] If we assume that HA was first conceived as a unified and standardised Latin collection in some Carolingian centre, which may be evident from its pericopal sequence and relative stylistic consistency,[55] then we could presume that an early witness in standard Latin would stand potentially closer to the autograph. The Épinal fragment might tell this story, although we note with some caution that the surviving text is

[52] Stotz, *Handbuch*, 3.VII:§184.

[53] Étaix, "Angers," 177. An earlier date of origin was already suggested by Rudolf ("The Homiliary of Angers," 181).

[54] See, for example, Rudolf, "Bamberg," 17–19.

[55] For the pericopal order of type 3B see A. Chavasse, "Les plus anciens types du lectionnaire et de l'antiphonaire romains de la messe," *RB* 62 (1952), 3–94. This is confirmed by Étaix, "Angers," 175 and Conti, "The Taunton Fragment," 3.

not extensive and might not be representative of the whole collection. That said, it is not difficult to imagine a consistency throughout the work of this late ninth-century scribe.[56]

Both the Épinal (HA 28–30) and Paris (HA 16–26) witnesses preserve chronological sequences of HA which may well have been drawn from exemplars holding the complete *Temporale* cycle. Still, Paris reveals that the selective use of HA sections was already practiced around the year 900 and that these could be combined with materials from other homiliaries (in this case the Hiberno-Latin *Catechesis Cracoviensis*). The new witnesses from Angers (HA 14 only) and Orléans (random order of HA 22, 53, 40, 50, 29, 15, 25) show an even greater flexibility and demonstrate the potential of HA to mix with catechetical and hagiographical material at an early stage. This codicological evidence hints at HA's pragmatic adaptation and repurposing, which must be considered a result of abundant use and reuse by members of the lower ranks of the clergy and for varying types of audiences, mainly lay. As a consequence, then, the range of various degrees of non-standard Latin in these early witnesses, especially given the Frankish background of many of them, comes as no surprise.

All this seems to indicate HA's practical importance as a collection, but also its lack of authority as an integral cycle in the eyes of some users. The Épinal (guarding folios) and Orléans (partly erased marginalia) witnesses both represent addenda to earlier main texts in their carrier manuscripts. Although their partial destruction is difficult to date it might have happened at a relatively early stage, as in the case of $\mathbf{f_B}$, thus suggesting a controversial reception of HA even before the turn of the millennium. Some preachers might have been

[56] For example, the diphthongs <ae> and <oe> are usually preserved as in *caelestis* (B18), *poeni(-)* (A7 and 8) and *poenam* (B16). Moreover, other non-classical spellings are rather limited and tend to be of the type that can be characterized as widespread for medieval Latin rather than indicative of the language of a particular area. For example, we see *condemp-* for *condemn-* (B12, 21, and 23) and we note only one instance of h-dropping, *omelia* for *homelia* (A15).

attracted by HA's concise, practical, manual-like style, while others may have shunned its occasionally unconventional exegesis, which usually lacks the gravitas of authoritative sources.[57]

As research in the past decade or so has continued to identify new, often partial witnesses to the Homiliary of Angers, it is worth taking stock of the progress made since Raymond Étaix's article that essentially brought the collection into a wider view after Recio's initial description. Étaix's description portrayed a modest work and understandably downplayed the significance of the collection's basic exegesis, simple style, and lack of authoritative sources. Further identifications have shown the evidently wide circulation of the collection. In addition, more recent work has emphasised the use of the collection for early vernacular expositions of biblical readings, with the Bamberg fragments (**f_B**) and the bilingual Taunton Fragment (**f_T**) serving as key pieces of evidence for France and England respectively. In this regard, the collection's circulation together with parts of the Saint-Père de Chartres collection (a.k.a. Pembroke 25 homiliary), a homiliary known to have served for vernacular exposition in both English and Norse traditions, has been critical.[58] However, HA, as modest as its style and contents are, could also have possessed more authority than its textual state

[57] On the plain style see Étaix, "Angers," 175; Conti, "Circulation," p. 376. Étaix described the collection as a "canevas." For a summary and discussion of sources see Étaix, "Angers," 175–76. On style and sources see further Rudolf, "The Homiliary of Angers," 174–79.

[58] The Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres was first described by Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens,* 17–25. The origin of the homiliary, which takes its name from the manuscript in Chartres, BM 25 (s. x/xi), remains uncertain; see James E. Cross, *Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25: A Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, KCLMS 1 (Exeter, 1987), 89. The earliest English copy of the Saint-Père homiliary discovered so far is Canterbury, Cathedral Library and Archives, Add. 127/12 (s. xi$^{in.}$); see Gneuss/Lapidge, no. 210. For further details on this homiliary see the contribution by Thomas N. Hall to this volume 000.

may suggest. Its readings, as shown above, are sometimes incorporated into lectionaries and falsely attributed to patristic authors.

The potential origins and provenances of the four new witnesses presented here also allow us more confidently to assume a ninth-century French origin of HA, probably as one of several pastoral reactions to the *Admonitio generalis*. Where exactly the text was first conceived still remains uncertain, but it had already reached a remarkable geographical dissemination by the end of the ninth century and would continue to influence large parts of Western Europe. In the manuscript witness from Orléans, probably a product of Fleury, we may be looking at an unusual and important witness with regard to the transmission of the collection to England, since the house educated eminent protagonists of the tenth-century Benedictine Reform, such as Oswald of Worcester, Osgar of Abingdon, and Germanus of Winchester.[59] Future research may be able to establish the exact textual relations between the four new witnesses and the five English witnesses in **J**, **O**, $\mathbf{X_{Ox}}$, $\mathbf{f_S}$, and $\mathbf{f_T}$.[60] This close

[59] For the connections between England and Fleury in the tenth century see Dom Louis Gougaud, "Les relations de l'abbaye de Fleury-sur-Loire avec la Bretagne et les Iles Britanniques (Xe et XIe siècles)," *Mémoires de la Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Bretagne* 4 (1923), 3–30; Jean Vezin, "Leofnoth, un scribe anglais à Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire," *Codices Manuscripti* 3 (1977), 109–20. Marco Mostert, "Relations between Fleury and England," in *England and the Continent in the Tenth Century*. *Studies in Honour of Wilhelm Levison (1876–1947)*, ed. D. Rollason, C. Leyser and H. Williams, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 37 (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 185–208; Michael Lapidge, "Abbot Germanus, Winchcombe, Ramsey and the Cambridge Psalter," in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifty Birthday*, ed. by Michael Korhammer with Karl Reichl and Hans Sauer (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1992), pp. 99–129; *Byrhtferth's Enchiridion*, ed. P. S. Baker and M. Lapidge, EETS s.s. 15 (Oxford, 1995), pp. xix–xxv.

[60] A preliminary analysis of the (admittedly very limited) textual overlap of parts of HA 40 (Fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost) in Orléans ($\mathbf{X_{Or}}$, s. ix/x) and London, BL, Sloane 280 ($\mathbf{f_S}$, s. x^2) shows exact correspondence in spelling and abbreviations.

analysis of the early manuscripts would mark a fundamental step towards a future critical edition and the informed choice of later representative manuscripts for the base text, unless further early and more complete witnesses can be found. However, HA belongs to the genre of anonymous preaching texts intended for lay congregations and therefore enjoyed an astonishing amount of fluidity for a Latin text. This enormously intriguing and revealing *variance* might merit a digital multiform edition in the future, which would map the various paths of HA across medieval Europe.[61]

[61] We acknowledge with thanks the many helpful comments on this paper by Julia Crick, Colleen Curran, Lukas Dorfbauer, David Ganz, and Thomas N. Hall.

L1 The Lenten Tithe of Days: An Old English Theme and Its Treatment and Sources in Three Anonymous Homilies (Irvine V, Napier LV, and Blickling III)

Robert Getz

The days of Lent, according to some early medieval authors, constitute a kind of tithe of the year (*decimae anni*) that may be rendered to God by works of penance and participation in spiritual things. The present essay explores the ways in which this idea occurs in Old English writings, evidenced implicitly in the compound *teoþungdagas* (tenth-days), which quantifies the part of the year occupied by Lent, and explicitly in several homilies that draw on Gregory the Great's explanation of the Lenten tithe of days in his *Homiliae in evangelia*. Although Gregory's calculation assumed a Lenten fast beginning in Quadragesima week and thus comprising thirty-six days, the common acceptance of Ash Wednesday as the beginning of the fast in the following centuries resulted in a discrepancy between the appointed number of fast-days (now forty) and a tenth part of the year. Despite this discrepancy, Anglo-Saxons of the tenth and eleventh centuries continued to make use of the idea that the Lenten fast amounted to a tithe of the year's days, apparently either considering the first four days of fasting as preliminary to the Lenten season proper or simply ignoring the difference between the inherited motif and their own practice. While the Old English homilies for Quadragesima Sunday that discuss the tithe of days all rely on Gregory, the anonymous homilies exhibit features independent of Gregory that deserve further examination. The author of the passage on the tithe of days ultimately transmitted in both Irvine V and Napier LV, in describing the Lenten fast as an appropriate practice for those who are unable to live in abstinence throughout the year, seems to have drawn on Isidore of Seville's *De ecclesiasticis officiis*. In Blickling III, the tithe of days is confused with the tithe of the year's produce in a way that suggests that an original analogy between these two types of tithes, such as that made in

Irvine V and Napier LV, was transformed into a prescription of both by an overzealous reviser.

L2 Cassian and Gregory

The notion of the Lenten tithe of days appears first in the *Collationes* of John Cassian. There Abbot Theonas, the persona through whom Cassian speaks, answers the question of his interlocutor Germanus about why Lent is observed for six weeks in some places and for seven weeks in others, and yet in neither case lasts forty days (as one might expect, given the biblical fasts of forty days of Christ, Moses, and Elijah, and the name "Quadragesima" itself).[1] Theonas, assuming a Lent of seven weeks, explains how the total time of fasting may then be reckoned as thirty-six and a half days—a tenth, or tithe, of the days of the year—if the practice of excluding Saturdays as well as Sundays from the fast is followed, with the exception of Holy Saturday (a fast-day) and the hours before dawn on Easter morning:

> Lege Moysaica uniuerso populo generalis promulgata praeceptio est: decimas tuas et primitias offeres domino deo tuo. Itaque qui substantiarum nostrarum omniumque fructuum decimas offerre praecipimur, multo magis necesse est ut ipsius quoque conuersationis nostrae et humani usus operumque nostrorum decimas offeramus, quae profecto in supputatione Quadragensimae euidenter implentur. Omnium enim dierum numerus, quibus reuolutus in orbem annus includitur, triginta sex semis dierum numero decimatur. In septem uero ebdomadibus, si dies dominici et sabbata subtrahantur, quinque et triginta supersunt dies ieiuniis deputati. Sed adiecta illa

[1] On the origins of the fast preceding Easter and the great variation in the early manner of its observance, see Thomas J. Talley, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year* (New York, 1986), pp. 163–230, and especially 214–22 on the ways of reckoning the forty days of Quadragesima and the associated days of fasting.

> uigiliarum die, qua usque in gallorum cantum inlucescente dominica ieiunium sabbati protelatur, non solum sex et triginta dierum numerus adimpletur, uerum etiam pro decimis quinque dierum, qui residui uidebantur, si illud quod superadiectum est noctis spatium conputetur, plenitudini totius summae nihil deerit.[2]

Theonas later explains that the same tithe of the year may be achieved in only six weeks, if (according to the usual western practice) Saturdays are included in the fast:

> Porro quod dicitis diuerso more, id est sex uel septem ebdomadibus per nonnullas prouincias Quadragensimam celebrari, una ratio idemque ieiuniorum modus diuersa ebdomadarum obseruatione concluditur. Hi enim sex ebdomadarum observantiam sibi

[2] John Cassian, *Collationes* 21.25.2, ed. Michael Petschenig, 2nd. ed. with supplements by Gottfried Kreuz (Vienna, 2004), p. 600: "Under the Mosaic law the command was given generally to all the people, 'You shall offer your tithes and first-fruits to the Lord your God.' Accordingly, we who are commanded to offer the tithes of all our wealth and gains, ought of necessity much more to offer tithes also of our very life and enjoyment of human existence, and of our works; and these indeed are manifestly fulfilled in the calculation of Lent. For the number of all the days in which the period of the year is comprised, being divided by ten, yields the number of thirty-six and a half days. In seven weeks, if the Sundays and Saturdays are excluded, thirty-five days appointed for fasting remain. But with the addition of the day of Easter vigil [Holy Saturday], when the fast of Saturday is extended to cock-crow at the dawning of Sunday, not only is the number of thirty-six days fulfilled, but even for the tithe corresponding to the five days that were left over, if the interval of night that is added at the end is counted, nothing will be lacking to the fullness of the whole sum." Translations of Latin and Old English are my own throughout. In the quotations of primary texts the punctuation has occasionally been altered from that of the editions used.

> praefixerunt, qui putant die quoque sabbati ieiunandum. Sex ergo in ebdomade ieiunia persoluunt, quae eosdem sex et triginta dies sexies reuoluta consummant.[3]

This explanation of the length and rationale of the Lenten fast was later adopted by Gregory the Great, at least in its essence, and further disseminated in the simpler form that he gave it in the sixteenth of his *Homiliae in evangelia*, composed for Quadragesima Sunday. Gregory was concerned only with the Lenten fast of six weeks that was then usual in the West, beginning on the Monday following Quadragesima Sunday, not the alternative seven-week fast mentioned by Cassian, and he also felt no need for his *decimae anni* to account for more than three hundred and sixty days of the year, ignoring the remaining five days for which Cassian had found *decimae* (at least approximately) in the pre-dawn hours of Easter Sunday:

> A praesenti etenim die usque ad paschalis sollemnitatis gaudia sex hebdomadae ueniunt, quarum uidelicet dies quadraginta et duo fiunt. Ex quibus dum sex dies dominici ab abstinentia subtrahuntur, non plus in abstinentia quam triginta et sex dies remanent. Dum uero per trecentos et sexaginta dies annus ducitur, nos autem per triginta et sex dies affligimur, quasi anni nostri decimas Deo damus, ut qui nobismetipsis per acceptum annum uiximus, auctori nostro nos in eius decimis per

[3] Cassian, *Collationes* 21.27.1, ed. Petschenig, pp. 602–3: "In regard to what you say about Lent's being celebrated in different ways in some lands, that is, over six or seven weeks, a single system and the same manner of fasting is maintained in the varying observance of weeks. For it was those who think that the fast is also to be kept on Saturday who decided on an observance of six weeks for themselves. They therefore make six fasts a week, and these six fasts, six times repeated, make up the same thirty-six days."

> abstinentiam mortificemus. Unde, fratres carissimi, sicut offerre in lege iubemini decimas rerum, ita ei offerre contendite et decimas dierum.[4]

L2 The Length of Lent

The basis of the calculations of Cassian and Gregory, the close correspondence of the length of the Lenten fast to a tenth of the days of the year, was not to last. A natural impulse to bring the length of the fast into harmony with the biblical fasts of forty days, especially Christ's fast in the desert, eventually led to the addition to the Lenten fast of the four days immediately preceding Quadragesima Sunday, so that the beginning of the fast (*caput ieunii*) fell on what is now known as Ash Wednesday. Even before Gregory's time, the masses celebrated on Wednesday and Friday in Quinquagesima week had been associated liturgically with the six weeks that followed, so that they must have seemed essentially to belong to the the Lenten season, and the Wednesday preceding Quadragesima Sunday to mark its beginning as far as the eucharistic liturgy was concerned, even if Quadragesima proper was yet to come.[5] At some time in the seventh or eighth century, however, it appears that the practice of fasting

---

[4] Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in evangelia* 16.5, ed. Raymond Étaix, CCSL 141 (Turnhout, 1999), pp. 113–14: "From the present day to the joys of the Easter feast there are six weeks, which comprise forty-two days. When the six Sundays in this period are excluded from the fast, there remain in it no more than thirty-six days. Since the year lasts for three hundred and sixty days, and we are afflicted for thirty-six days, we give a tithe of our year, so to speak, to God, in order that we who have lived for ourselves throughout the year that we have received may mortify ourselves to our creator through fasting in the tenth part of it. Therefore, dearest brethren, in the same way that you were commanded in the law to offer a tithe of possessions, strive to offer to him also a tithe of days." It is notable that in many manuscripts the five days ignored by Gregory are restored by the addition of *(et) quinque* after *trecentos et sexaginta*.

[5] Patrick Regan, "The Three Days and the Forty Days," in *Between Memory and Hope: Readings on the Liturgical Year*, ed. Maxwell E. Johnson (Collegeville, 2000), pp. 136–37.

throughout the four days immediately preceding Quadragesima Sunday was widely adopted, so that the thirty-six days of fasting referred to by Gregory were extended to the desired forty. The so-called Old Gelasian Sacramentary, preserved in a manuscript written circa 750 A.D., describes a ritual for entering into public penance appointed to take place "IIII feria mane in capite Quadragesimae" (on Wednesday morning at the beginning of Quadragesima), and the first collect that it provides for the Mass of the day speaks of "inquoata ieiunia" (the fasts that have been begun).[6] Amalarius of Metz, writing in the first third of the ninth century, declares explicitly that the Lenten fast begins on the Wednesday between Quinquagesima and Quadragesima Sundays and consequently comprises exactly forty days, since it lasts from this Wednesday through Holy Saturday, the Sundays within this period being excepted.[7] Interestingly, Amalarius refers to Gregory's statement in *Homilia* 16 that there are thirty-six days of fasting in Lent and advances an explanation for the discrepancy, suggesting that in Gregory's time the four days from the aforementioned Wednesday until Quadragesima Sunday had not yet been added (to the fast).[8] References to Ash Wednesday as *caput ieiunii*

---

[6] *Liber sacramentorum Romanae aeclesiae ordinis anni circuli* 1.16–17, ed. Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, 3rd ed. revised and supplemented by Leo Eizenhöfer, Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta, Series maior, Fontes 4 (Rome, 1981), pp. 18–19. Bernard Moreton, *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary: A Study in Tradition*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford, 1976), p. 44, thought that the four-day extension of the fast occurred "most probably in the eighth century."

[7] *Liber officialis* 1.7.1–2, ed. I. M. Hanssens, *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia*, 2:47: "Quarta feria inter quinquagesimam et quadragesimam ieiunium, quod protenditur usque in pascha Domini, inchoamus ... exceptis sex diebus dominicis infra quadragesimam, quadraginta tantummodo sunt a memorata feria usque in sabbato sancto."

[8] *Liber officialis* 1.7.3, ed. Hanssens, 2:48: "sanctus Gregorius tantummodo triginta et sex dies abstinentiae nobis insinuat quadragesimalis temporis, forsan quia nondum erant additi quattuor dies a supra dicta feria quarta usque ad dominicum quadragesimae."

are plentiful in early English writings, at least from the period of the Benedictine Reform on. A monastic service for Ash Wednesday is described in the *Regularis Concordia*, and a sermon composed by Ælfric for Quinquagesima Sunday begins with a description, clearly for the benefit of laypeople, of the imposition of ashes that would take place "on ðysse wucan on Wodnesdæg" (on this week on Wednesday).[9]

Although at first the fast begun on Ash Wednesday (*ieiunium*) was regarded as distinct from the Lenten season proper (*Quadragesima*), still understood to begin only with Quadragesima Sunday, this distinction inevitably broke down, and Ash Wednesday came in time to be recognised as the beginning of Lent itself.[10] It is clear, however, that at least some Anglo-Saxons preserved the distinction between Lent and the fast begun on Ash Wednesday: one of several reasons why we know that Ælfric's sermon describing Ash Wednesday was intended for Quinquagesima is that it is prefaced with the words "Þis spel gebyrað seofon niht ær lenctene" (This sermon is appropriate seven days before *lencten*), where *lencten* plainly refers to Quadragesima Sunday.[11] Ash Wednesday seems similarly to be regarded as separate from *lencten* in the Old English penitentials, which state that in overseas parts "ælc bisceop

---

[9] *Regularis Concordia* 34, ed. and trans. Thomas Symons, *Regularis Concordia: The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation* (London, 1953), pp. 32–33; see also Lucia Kornexl, ed., *Die Regularis Concordia und ihre altenglische Interlinearversion,* TUeP 17 (Munich, 1993), pp. 66–69, where the blessing and imposition of the ashes is described in lines 777–81; see further Ælfric's sermon in *LS*, 1:260. The sermon, despite titles associating it with *caput ieiunii* in three of the four manuscripts in which it is extant (thus Skeat's title *In caput ieiunii*, from Cotton Julius E. vii), was clearly intended for Quinquagesima Sunday, the occasion named in the fourth manuscript (CCCC 303), as internal evidence indicates, including the apology offered near the conclusion, "We sædon nu þis spel, forðan þe her bið læs manna on Wodnesdæg, ðonne nu todæg beoð" (We have given this sermon now, because fewer people will be here on Wednesday than there are today, 1:282).

[10] Talley, *Origins*, pp. 221–22.

[11] *LS*, 1:260.

bið æt his biscopstole on þæne wodnesdæg þe we cweðað *caput ieiunium* ær lenctene" (every bishop is at his see on the Wednesday that we call *caput ieiunium* [*sic*] before Lent).[12] On this understanding, the Lenten season proper includes only thirty-six days of fasting, and Gregory's calculation remains intact. Further evidence of a Lent of thirty-six days is found in CUL Ii. 2. 11, one of the witnesses to the West Saxon Gospels, which incorporates many rubrics that indicate the day in the liturgical year on which a given passage was to be read at mass.[13] It is notable that the rubric preceding Matthew 25:31 reads "Ðys sceal on monandæg on forman fæstendæg" (This is to be read on Monday, on the first fast-day): since the Gospel pericope Matthew 25:31–46 was widely used in early medieval England for the Monday following Quadragesima Sunday, the *fæstendagas* implied in the rubric evidently began on this day, not Ash Wednesday, and were thirty-six in number.[14] For some Anglo-Saxons, then, the calculation of thirty-six fast-days in Lent must have seemed accurate, inasmuch as they did not consider the four fast-days in Quinquagesima week a part of Lent. A notable remark in Ælfric's sermon for Quinquagesima Sunday suggests that in his day the laity were not necessarily aware of these four days of fasting:

---

[12] J. Raith, ed., *Die altenglische Version des Halitgar'schen Bussbuches* (1933; repr. Darmstadt 1964), pp. 10–11.

[13] On these rubrics and their purpose, see Ursula Lenker, "The *West Saxon Gospels* and the Gospel-Lectionary in Anglo-Saxon England: Manuscript Evidence and Liturgical Practice," *ASE* 28 (1999), 141–78.

[14] W. W. Skeat, ed., *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew and according to Saint Mark* (Darmstadt, 1970; originally published in 2 vols. as *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*, 1871, and *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, 1887), p. 206. On the pericope, see Ursula Lenker, *Die Westsächsische Evangelienversion und die Perikopenordnungen im angelsächsischen England*, TUeP 20 (Munich, 1997), p. 309 (see also p. 68 on the significance of the note in CUL Ii. 2. 11).

> Nu ne beoð na feowertig daga on urum lenctenlicum fæstene gefyllede, buton we fæsten þær foran to þas feower dagas, wodnesdæg and þunresdæg and frigedæg and sæternesdæg, swa swa hit gefyrn geset wæs, þeah ðe we hit eow nu secgan.[15]

While Ælfric asserts that the necessity of fasting on these four days was established long ago, the immediately following concession "although we tell you about it now" implies that he did not expect his audience to be well acquainted with the fact.

L2 *Teoþungdagas*: An Old English Compound alluding to the Tithe of Days

Some late Anglo-Saxons were in any case content to describe the Lenten fast as a tithe of the year, as Old English evidence shows. The compound *teoþungdagas*, literally "tithe-days, tenth-days," which occurs in a number of texts, seems to be a vernacular adaptation of *decimae anni*, meaning essentially "days that amount to a tenth or tithe of the year." In the Old English version of the *Capitula* of Theodulf of Orléans in CCCC 201, the days of Lent are said to be "teoðungdagas þæs geares" (the year's tithe-days) precisely where Theodulf had used the phrase "decimae ... anni nostri" (a tithe of our year), adopting Gregory's wording ("quasi anni nostri decimas Deo damus").[16] Ælfric and Wulfstan referred to the days of Lent as *teoþungdagas* in homilies for the First Sunday in Lent (Quadragesima Sunday), where the focus is naturally on the following six weeks of penance, comprising thirty-six fast-days, and the appellation thus seems apposite. Although Wulfstan offered no explanation of the term, he

---

[15] *LS*, 1:260–62: "Now forty days will not be completed in our Lenten fast, unless we fast beforehand for these four days, Wednesday and Thursday and Friday and Saturday, as it was established long ago, although we tell you about it now."

[16] Hans Sauer, ed., *Theodulfi Capitula in England: Die altenglischen Übersetzungen, zusammen mit dem lateinischen Text herausgegeben*, TUeP 8 (Munich, 1978), p. 385 (A-text, line 7).

nonetheless made it clear that in some way Lent constituted a tithe of the year, paid to God like other tithes, but in days rather than material goods:

> Us gebyreð þæt we ælces þinges ure teoðunge rihtlice Gode betæcan. Đonne syndan þas dagas getealde for teoðingdagas innan geares fæce, & we sculan eac þa teoþunge wyrðlice Gode gelæstan.[17]

The word is also used without explanation in an anonymous writer's exhortation to confession during Lent preserved in London, BL, Cotton Tiberius A. iii, where the statement "Þis feortig daga fæsten us is geset to teoþingdagum þæs geares" (This fast of forty days is appointed for us as the year's tithe-days) suggests that the original notion of a precise tithe of the year's days had been forgotten.[18] Ælfric, however, made the calculation that warranted the term *teoþungdagas* explicit, presenting an explanation of the tithe of days in *CH* I, XI, that is dependent on Gregory's homily:

> Hwi is þis fæsten þus geteald þurh feowertig daga? On eallum geare sind getealde þreo hund daga & fif & sixtig daga. þonne gif we teoðiað þas gearlican dagas. þonne beoð þær six & þrittig teoðincgdagas: & fram þisum dæge oð ðam halgum easterdæge:

[17] Dorothy Bethurum, ed., *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford, 1957), p. 233, lines 11–14: "We are obliged to offer our tithe of everything properly to God. These days are regarded as tithe-days within the space of the year, and we must fittingly pay this tithe to God too."

[18] H. Logeman, "Anglo-Saxonica Minora," *Anglia* 12 (1889), 514, lines 7–8; the quotation incorporates Logeman's emendation of manuscript *git* to *geset*.

> Sind twa & feowertig daga: do þonne þa six sunnandagas of ðam getæle. þonne beoð þa six & þrittig. þæs geares teoðingdagas us to forhæfednysse getealde.[19]

While the reason for calling the fast-days in Lent *teoþungdagas* is thus made clear, Ælfric's initial question why the fast has a duration of forty days receives only an implicit answer that may seem less than satisfactory, namely, that forty days is approximately the period of time required to yield a tithe of the year—thirty-six days of actual fasting within a larger span of forty-two days.[20] There is no mention here of the four days of fasting beginning on Ash Wednesday that Ælfric drew attention to in his later Quinquagesima Sunday sermon, which might serve to reconcile the notions of a forty-day fast, if understood to begin before the Lenten season proper, and a Lenten tithe of days: perhaps Ælfric simply did not want details such as these to distract him from the purpose of preparing his audience for the six weeks of Lent to come.

L2 The Old English Homiletic Witnesses

[19] *CH* I, p. 273, lines 189–95: "Why is this fast thus reckoned to last forty days? In the whole year there are in total three hundred sixty-five days: if we divide these days of the year by ten, then there will be thirty-six "tithe-days," and from this day until the holy Easter Day there are forty-two days. Subtract the six Sundays from that number: then there will be thirty-six "tithe-days" of the year in total for our abstinence." Another instance of *teoþungdagas* follows in the next sentence (line 198), and the so-called "Admonitions in Lent" of Ælfric, edited by Benjamin Thorpe in *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, 2 vols. (London, 1844–46), 2:608, also attest it: "On Lenctene sind getealde ealles ðæs geares teoðungdagas" ("In Lent are comprised tithe-days for the whole year").

[20] As M. Bradford Bedingfield remarks in *The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 1 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2002), p. 80, Ælfric "seems to create a problem by prefacing Gregory's calculations" with this question.

Ælfric's demonstration that the days of fasting in the six weeks of Lent following the First Sunday in Lent constitute a tithe of the year is not unique in Old English. Three anonymous homilies present very similar calculations: Blickling III (HomS 10), Irvine V (HomU 1), and Napier LV (HomU 44).[21] Although the occasion for which the latter two were intended is not specified in the manuscripts that preserve them, internal evidence makes it virtually certain that they, like Blickling III and Ælfric's *CH* I, XI, were composed for the First Sunday in Lent. Irvine V, preserved in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343, is an exposition of the usual pericope for the day, Matthew 4:1–11, describing the temptation of Christ in the wilderness.[22] Napier LV is a composite work found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 114, that is derived from various sources, but a great part of the text is drawn in particular from the other homily that Ælfric composed for the First Sunday in Lent, *CH* II, VII.[23] The introduction of the latter work is among the excerpts that the compiler of Napier LV used, including its reference to the beginning of Lent as the time of the year ("ðes gearlica ymryne us gebrincð efne nu þa clænan tid lenctenlices fæstenes").[24] Where Napier LV shares material with another composite work in Hatton 114, HomS 30, the former mentions the necessity of properly observing "þas halgan lenctenlice tide" (this holy season of Lent) where the latter homily, intended for Rogationtide, speaks of "þissa þreora daga fæsten" (the fast of these three days).[25] It is plain therefore that Napier LV was intended to be used at the beginning of

[21] *BH*, pp. 27–39; Napier, pp. 282–89; and Irvine, pp. 136–43.

[22] For further evidence favouring the First Sunday in Lent, see Irvine, p. 116.

[23] For the sources, see Michael J. Cummings, "Napier Homily 55 and Belfour Homily 10 on the Temptations in the Desert," *NM* 79 (1980), 316–17.

[24] *CH* II, p. 60, lines 1–2: "the course of the year brings us just now the pure time of the Lenten fast" (cf. Napier, p. 284, lines 18–20).

[25] Napier, p. 284, line 29; Bazire-Cross, p. 109, lines 18–19. This difference was noted by Cummings, "Napier Homily 55," 316.

Lent, and almost certainly on its first Sunday, when the equation of a tithe of the year with thirty-six days of fasting would be most apt.

While these three anonymous homilies all offer the tithe of the year calculation, the treatments of the tithe of days in Irvine V and Napier LV spring from the same Old English original, as Michael Cummings showed, who argued convincingly further that the compiler of Napier LV had excerpted the relevant passage from an existing homily substantially the same as Irvine V, that is, from an earlier version of Irvine V that ultimately survived as a whole only in the copy made in Bodley 343 in the latter half of the twelfth century.[26] It is probable that Napier LV is a closer witness to this part of the antecedent homily in its original form than Irvine V, since Napier LV elsewhere exhibits only minimal textual deviation from the other homilies from which its compiler excerpted, while the many copies of vernacular homilies transmitted in Bodley 343, but composed in the Anglo-Saxon period, are greatly affected by the linguistic change that had taken place since the latter part of the eleventh century.[27] For purposes of textual comparison here, Napier LV will therefore be used to represent the relevant part of the original homily from which the passages in Irvine V and Napier LV descend, while the original homily itself will be referred to as *O* for the sake of clarity and brevity. There are thus three independent explanations of the Lenten tithe of days in Old English, originating in three homilies for the First Sunday in Lent: Ælfric's *CH* I, XIX, Blickling III, and the anonymous homily *O* that is now represented in its complete form only by Irvine V. Gregory's *Homilia* 16 is known to have been used as a major source (or at least ultimate source) by the authors of these three homilies, and their treatments of this topic all

[26] Cummings, "Napier Homily 55."

[27] On the variation of Napier 55 from its sources, see Cummings, "Napier Homily 55," 316–317.

resemble the similar passage in Gregory.[28] It will be here proposed, however, that at least one of the two anonymous homilists, and perhaps both, did not rely on Gregory alone but also drew on another Latin source in treating the Lenten tithe of days.

L2 The Tithe of Days in Irvine Homily V and Napier Homily LV (*O*)

Some features of the passage in *O* seem to have been developed independently of Gregory. In the first place, its starting point is the tithe of worldly goods commanded by God in the Mosaic law (Lev. 27:30–33), and the Lenten tithe of days is subsequently introduced as a kind of alternative to this earlier tithe. In Gregory, however, the Mosaic tithe is mentioned only near the end of the excerpt from *Homilia* 16 quoted above ("sicut offerre in lege iubemini decimas rerum"), following the calculation showing that thirty-six days make up a tithe of the year. In Napier LV the discussion of the two tithes (of worldly goods and of days) begins thus:

> Hwæt we witan and leorniað, þæt þæt wæs beboden on þære ealdan æ, þæt manna gehwylc sceolde symle ymb xii monað þone teoðan dæl his woruldæhta for Gode gesyllan; and nu, men þa leofestan, swa þonne is nu eac swyðe god and swyðe rihtlic to donne. Gyf þæt þonne hwylc man seo, þæt him þæt on his mode to uneþelic þince, tylige he þonne la hwæþere, þæt he huru þone teoþan dæl his daga for Gode gedo. Hwæt we witan, þæt on xii monþum beoð iii hund daga and sixtig daga and fif dagas and eac six tida; and þises fæstenes is twa and feowertig daga. And gif we þonne þa

[28] On the dependence of these homilies on Gregory, see Malcolm Godden, ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary,* EETS s.s. 18 (Oxford, 2000), pp. 84–85 and 93; Max Förster, "Zu den Blickling Homilies," *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 91 (1893), 180–82; Irvine, pp. 117–18 and (on this passage in particular) 133.

> six sunnandagas of adoð, þe we swæsendo on habbað, þonne ne bið þæs fæstenes þonne ma þonne six and xxx daga; and hwæt þæt þonne bið se teoða dæl þæra xii monþa.[29]

While the construction "ne bið þæs fæstenes þonne ma þonne six and xxx daga" at the end of the passage in Napier LV ("ne beoð þær buton six ant þrittig dagene þæs fæstenes" in Irvine V) closely resembles Gregory's "non plus in abstinentia quam triginta et sex dies remanent," the two sentences that precede the calculation of the tithe of the year are plainly not derived, at least in the main, from Gregory. In these the homilist first took care to explain that a tithe of worldly goods had been enjoined under the Mosaic law, and that to offer such a tithe was still a good thing to do, if not obligatory. Anyone who found it too difficult, he continued, should endeavour to offer a tithe at least of his days to God. The subsequent calculation of the tithe of the year agrees with Gregory, except that the homilist was more exact in his specification of the year's length, including not only the five days that Gregory saw fit to ignore but also the remaining six hours of the solar year according to the Julian calendar. While the difference from Gregory in content and progession of thought may seem minor, it should be considered in conjunction with the remarks on the observation of Lent that follow immediately in *O*,

[29] Napier, p. 283, line 23, – p. 284, line 7 (cf. Irvine, p. 143, lines 173–83): "We know and learn that it was commanded in the old law, that every person should give up the tenth part of his worldly goods for the love of God; and now too, dearest friends, it is very good and very right to do so. But if there is anyone to whose mind that seems too difficult, let him then endeavour indeed nonetheless to live the tenth part of his days, at any rate, for the love of God. We know that in twelve months there are three hundred sixty-five days and also six hours; and this fast occupies forty-two days. And therefore if we exclude the six Sundays when we have meals, then there are no more than thirty-six days to the fast; and that, as you know, is the tenth part of those twelve months."

which are not dependent on Gregory.[30] There the author of *O* declared that whoever lived in austerity and abstinence at all times would be "fulfremed" (perfect), but those for whom that would be too difficult should fast at least during Lent, and especially then practice good works and devotions:

> And se man, se ðe wile on ælce tid heardlice and forwernedlice lyfigean, se bið fulfremed. Gyf þæt þonne hwylc mon sy, þæt him on his mode to earfoðe þince, þæt he on ælce tid swa forwernedlice lyfige, tylige he þonne huru, þæt he þis fæsten selost afæste, æghwæþer ge on sealmsange ge on ælmesdædum ge on halgum gebedum ge on ælcum þæra goda, þe he for Gode to gode gedon mage, þæt we þonne ealle motan on þas halgan tide, þe nu toweard is, æghwæðer ge for Gode ge for worulde þy gefealicor and ðe bliþelicor lifian.[31]

The occurrence in *O* of both a preliminary mention of the tithe of worldly goods enjoined under the Mosaic law as the antecessor of a Lenten tithe of days, and an understanding of the latter as a practice appropriate for those not able to live perfectly all the year round, may be compared to the treatment of the tithe of days in the *De ecclesiasticis officiis* of Isidore of Seville, which Michael Lapidge numbered among the "small core of

[30] In her source apparatus Irvine (p. 143) described this part of the passage that Irvine V shares with Napier LV (together with a brief closing formula found only in Irvine V) as "an independent conclusion."

[31] Napier, p. 284, lines 7–17 (cf. Irvine, p. 143, lines 183–89): "And that person who is willing to live austerely and with self-denial at all times is perfect. But if there is anyone to whose mind it seems too burdensome, that he should live with such self-denial at all times, let him then endeavour at least to observe this fast in the best manner, in singing of psalms and in almsgiving and in holy prayers and in each of the good works by which he can do good for the love of God, so that then we may all, in the holy season that is now at hand, live the more joyously and the more happily in the sight of God and the world."

staple patristic texts" found in the typical monastic library of early medieval England.[32] There, in his discussion of Lent, Isidore reworked excerpts from Cassian's *Collationes*, including the basis for the calculation of the tithe of the year that has been quoted above, in order to offer an exposition of the tithe of days that follows the order of thought evident in *O*: a) a tithe of worldly goods was commanded under the Mosaic Law; b) an analogous tithe may be fulfilled by Christians by the offering of the thirty-six fasting days of the last six weeks of Lent to God; c) this practice is not meant for the perfect, but for those who are involved in worldly pleasures and affairs during the rest of the year.[33] Isidore's argument may be thus divided into the sentences that express these three thoughts:

> [*a*] Lege enim Moysaica generaliter uniuerso populo est praeceptum decimas et primitias offerre domino deo. [*b*] Itaque dum in hac sententia principia uoluntatum consummationesque operum nostrorum referre ad dei gratiam ammoneamur, in supputatione tamen quadragensimae summa ista legalium decimarum expletur (totus enim anni tempus xxxvi dierum numero decimatur), subtractis a quadragensima diebus dominicis quibus ieiunia resoluuntur; atque his diebus quasi pro totius anni decimis ad ecclesiam concurrimus, actuumque nostrorum operationem deo in hostiam iubilationis offerimus. [*c*] Cuius quidem quadragensimae legis, sicut ait noster Cassianus, quique perfecti sunt non tenentur nec exigui huius canonis subiectione contenti sunt; quem

[32] CPL 1207; *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. Christopher M. Lawson, CCSL 113 (Turnhout, 1989). See Michael Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford, 2006), p. 127.

[33] The source passages occur in *Collationes* 21.25.2–3 (corresponding to sentence *a* and to *b* through *resoluuntur*), 21.26.2 (*hostiam iubilationis suae deo ... offerentes*) and 6 (*priusquam cunctorum actuum suorum operationumque primitias ad ecclesiam concurrentes diuino studeant sacrare conspectui*), and 21.29.1 (corresponding nearly verbatim to sentence *c*). These are noted in the source apparatus for the passage in *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (1.37.4–5) in Lawson's edition, pp. 43–44.

> profecto illis qui per totum anni spatium deliciis ac negotiis saecularibus inplicantur ecclesiarum principes statuerunt ut, uel hac legali quodammodo necessitate constricti, his saltem diebus uacare domino cogerentur ac dierum uitae suae, quos totos quasi fructus quosdam fuerant, uoraturi, uel decimas domino dedicarent.[34]

Isidore's immediate transition from the notion of the fasting days in Lent as a tithe of the year in sentence *b* to that of their suitability for those who cannot live apart from the pleasures and affairs of the world throughout the year in sentence *c* is paralleled by the same transition in *O*, where the second of the two passages quoted from it above follows the first immediately. The person in *O* who is regarded as perfect ("fulfremed"), inasmuch as he leads a life of

[34] Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* 1.37.4–5, ed. Lawson, pp. 43–44. "For under the Mosaic Law the whole people generally was commanded to offer tithes and first-fruits to the Lord God. And while we may be admonished in this pronouncement to refer the beginnings of our intentions and the ends of our works to the grace of God, nonetheless in the reckoning up of Lent ("quadragensimae") the sum of the tithes of the Law is fulfilled (for a division of the whole period of the year into a tenth part is achieved by the number of thirty-six days), when the Sundays on which the fast is broken are removed from Lent; and on these days, as though for a tithe of the whole year, we hasten together to church and offer the performance of our acts to God as a sacrifice of jubilation. Those that are perfect, as our Cassian says, are not bound by the law of this Lent, nor are they content with subjection to this meager rule, which indeed the princes of the churches established for those who are involved in pleasures and worldly affairs throughout the whole period of the year, in order that, being constrained in some manner, if only by necessity of law, they might be compelled at least on these days to devote themselves to the Lord and to dedicate to the Lord at least a tithe of the days of their life, which they had been ready to consume entire like fruits of some kind." In sentence *c* above, Lawson (pp. 118, 131) accepts *legis* as an Isidorean use of the genitive for the ablative; alternatively, one might suppose that *legis* was erroneously written in the archetype by attraction to the preceding genitives and that *lege* (found in some branches of the manuscript tradition, in competition with the similar correction *legibus*; see the apparatus and Lawson's discussion on p. 100*) was the reading intended by Isidore, in agreement with the source sentence in Cassian (beginning *Hac igitur Quadragensimae lege*, 21.29.1).

abstinence all the time ("on ælce tid"), not only in Lent, resembles the perfect ones ("perfecti") described by Isidore, who are not content to abstain from pleasures only in Lent. It is remarkable that the same distinction between the perfect and (by implication) imperfect is made in *O* and Isidore, despite the fact that these texts were evidently intended for different audiences: the Old English homilist directly addresses the "imperfect" person for whom year-round abstinence is too difficult, while Isidore, following Cassian, seems to consider the brief Lenten fast almost an indulgence to the laity, who are unable to follow monastic practices. The homilist's repeated intimation that the tithe of days is the least sacrifice one may offer to God ("tylige he þonne la hwæþere, þæt he huru þone teoþan dæl his daga for Gode gedo" and "tylige he þonne huru, þæt he þis fæsten selost afæste"), in which *huru* (at least) appears twice, resembles Isidore's assertion that the observation of Lent was devised for worldly people as the least that they could do by way of abstinence, as the phrases "saltem his diebus" (at least on these days) and "uel decimas" (at least a tithe) make emphatically clear. Some similarity of construction, finally, is evident in the sentences that introduce the tithe of days in *O* and *De ecclesiasticis officiis*: "þæt wæs beboden on þære ealdan æ" (in Irvine V, "soðlice hit wæs iboden and ihaten on þare ealde æ") is conceivably modelled on "lege enim Moysaica ... est praeceptum," which it certainly resembles more than the corresponding words in Gregory, "in lege iubemini," which occur only later in his treatment of the topic. Since the text of *O* follows the same progression of thought as Isidore, not Gregory (or, for that matter, Isidore's source, Cassian), and has material not from Gregory that corresponds very closely to the sentence in Isidore labeled *c* above, it seems probable that its author drew on *De ecclesiasticis officiis* as well as Gregory's homily in his discussion of the tithe of days.

L2 The Tithe of Days in Blickling Homily III

In Blickling III the topic of the Lenten tithe of days is also introduced with an allusion to the tithe of worldly goods commanded by God in the Mosaic law, yet in a manner quite different from that of Irvine V and Napier LV:

> Hwæt we gehyrdon nu þæt we sceolan under þæm feowerteoþan gerime, swa swa geara beboden wæs Godes folce, syllan þone teoþan dæl ure worldspeda þe we habban, & we sceolan ure daga þone teoþan dæl on forhæfdnesse lifgean. Geare we witon þæt on þæm geare bið þreo hund daga & fif & syxtig daga; gif we þonne on þæm syx wucan forlætaþ þa syx sunnandagas þæs fæstennes, þonne ne bið þara fæstendaga na ma þonne syx & þritig, & gif we þa dagas fulfremedlice for Gode lifgeaþ, þonne hæbbe we ure daga þone teoþan dæl for Gode gedon.[35]

The Blickling homilist thus seems to regard paying some kind of tithe of material goods as obligatory for his audience, unlike the author of *O*, as the clause "we sceolan ... syllan þone teoþan dæl ure worldspeda þe we habban" implies. Yet the interpretation of the introductory sentence in which this statement occurs poses some difficulties, in regard to both the immediate context and the meaning of the phrase "under þæm feowerteoþan gerime." In the first place, the absence in the earlier part of the homily of any mention of tithes, and in particular of a tithe of worldly goods, seems to contradict the plain sense of the words "Hwæt

[35] *BH*, p. 35, lines 17–26: "We have heard now that, just as God's people was commanded long ago, in that count of forty we are to render the tenth part of our worldly goods that we have, and we are to live the tenth part of our days in abstinence. We know well that there are three hundred sixty-five days in the year; and therefore if in the six weeks of the fast we omit the six Sundays, there will be no more than thirty-six days of fasting, and if we live those days entirely for the love of God, then we shall have rendered a tenth of our days for the love of God."

we gehyrdon nu," according to which the homilist should be expected to assert as something that "we are to do" only what he has already spoken of explicitly. The other four instances of the formulaic sentence opening *Hwæt we gehyrdon* in Blickling III thus all recall something that has already been stated earlier in the homily.[36] Here the "nu" that follows this phrase ought to indicate further that it is what immediately precedes, "what we have *just* heard," that is being recapitulated; yet the immediately preceding sentences make no mention of a tithe at all, but are concerned rather with the associations of the number forty:

> Riht þæt is þæt ealle geleaffulle men þis feowertig daga on forhæfdnesse lifgean. & eac us is to geþencenne þæt we sceolan þa ten bebodu healdan & þa lara þara feower godspellera, forðon þe ure lichoma wæs gesceapen of feower gesceaftum, of eorþan & of fyre & of wætere & of lyfte. Swa we eac agyltaþ þurh feower þing: þurh geþoht & þurh word & þurh weorc & þurh willan; swylce eac feower tida syndan on þæm geare on þæm we oft agyltað. Þonne sculon we eft on þære forhæfdnesse on þyssum feowertigum nihta þæt geclænsian.[37]

[36] *BH*, p. 29, lines 12–14 (cf. p. 27, lines 3–4); pp. 33, lines 2–4 (cf. p. 27, lines 10–11, 15–17); p. 35, lines 4–5 (cf. p. 27, lines 23–24); p. 37. lines 22–24 (cf. p. 37, lines 17–19).

[37] *BH*, p. 35, lines 8–17: "It is right that all faithful people should live in abstinence for these forty days. And we should also resolve that we shall keep the ten commandments and the teachings of the four evangelists, since our body was made of four elements, of earth and fire and water and air. So too we transgress through four things, through thought and word and work and will; likewise there are also four seasons in the year in which we often transgress. We must thus in turn purge that in that abstinence during these forty days." I omit the Tironian note found in the manuscript between "on þære forhæfdnesse" and "on þyssum feowertigum nihta" as an erroneous scribal addition.

It is not clear, therefore, how the context warrants an assertion that the audience addressed has "just heard" that they are obliged to pay a tithe of their wordly goods. It may, however, justify the later clause "we sceolan ure daga þone teoþan dæl on forhæfdnesse lifgean," which recalls the first sentence in the excerpt quoted above, if it is granted that "the tenth part of our days" is already present by implication in the notion of the Lenten fast ("þis feowertig daga"), and that the homilist is simply making it explicit in the arithmetical demonstration that follows.

The sentences preceding "Hwæt we gehyrdon nu" also seem to provide a basis for the use there of the phrase "under þæm feowerteoþan gerime," literally "under the fortieth count or number."[38] Yet just what this phrase means in conjunction with the tithe of worldly goods that seems to be connected with it is far from clear. While the tithe of days is offered to God by fasting and other works of penance precisely during the "forty days" of Lent, there is no obvious reason why a tithe of worldly goods of any kind, such as a tithe of the year's produce, should be offered in the same season. Ælfric mentioned a tithe of the year's produce specifically in *CH* I, XI, where he compared it to the tithe of days without implying that it should be paid during the *teoþungdagas* of Lent: "Swa swa Godes æ us bebyt þæt we scolon ealle þa ðinc þe us gescotað of ures geares teolunge Gode þa teoðunge syllan, swa we scolon eac on ðisum teoðingdagum urne lichaman mid forhæfednysse Gode to lofe teoðian."[39] According to a law first promulgated in Edgar's reign, tithes of the young of livestock were to

[38] The manuscript reading "feowerteoþan" may be a corruption of a form of the word "fortieth" (*feowertigoþa*) with *g* such as *feowerteog(o)þan*, confused with "fourteenth" (*feowerteoþa*), but *-teoþa* frequently appears instead of expected *-tigoþa* in late West Saxon documents; see the citations and attested spellings s.v. *fēowertigoþa* in the *DOE*, and Alistair Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), § 694, n. 2.

[39] *CH* I, p. 273, lines 196–99: "Just as God's law commands us that we are to render to God the tithe of all the things that fall to our share out of our year's labour, so also in these tithe-days are we to pay a tithe of our body by means of abstinence for the praise of God."

be paid by Pentecost and tithes of crops by the autumnal equinox.[40] It is notable that a brief discourse on tithing composed by Ælfric is preserved as an appendix to the copy of a homily for the Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost in CCCC 178, which would place the time of its preaching near the beginning of the harvest season, appropriate, as John C. Pope observed, for such an admonition.[41] In several later law codes, All Saints is specified as the day by which tithes of crops must be paid (or these are to be paid by the equinox or at least by the feast of All Saints), and several anonymous homilies accordingly recognise an obligation to pay the tithes mentioned above by Pentecost and All Saints respectively.[42] Even if the author of Blickling III wrote before these times for payment of tithes were firmly established, it is not clear how he could have expected his audience to render both a tithe of days and a tithe of worldly goods *under þæm feowerteoþan gerime*: a tithe of the latter kind has no obvious connection to either the number forty or the season of Lent.

While it might be argued that this incongruity is due to mere carelessness on the part of the author of Blickling III, the possibility that the phrase in which the tithe of worldly goods is mentioned has been altered from its original form should also be reckoned with. In *CH* I, XI, Ælfric compared the tithe of worldly goods to the tithe of days in parallel clauses (*Swa swa ... swa*): if it is supposed that the author of Blickling III had wished to compare these two tithes in the same way—though, like the author of *O*, treating the tithe of worldly goods not as a present obligation but as part of the Mosaic law—he might have originally

---

[40] *II Edgar* 3; Felix Liebermann, ed., *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols. (Halle, 1903–16), 1:196. On the history of this legislation, see William A. Chaney, *The Cult of Kingship in Anglo-Saxon England* (Berkeley, 1970), pp. 241–42.

[41] For the text, see Pope, 2:806–8; see Pope's remarks on the time of the year chosen at 2:801–2.

[42] *VIII Æthelred* 9.1, ed. Liebermann, *Gesetze*, 1:265: "be emnihte oððe huru be ealra halgena mæssan"; see also *V Æthelred* 11.1, *VI Æthelred* 16, and *I Cnut* 8.1. Napier XXIII (*Wulfstan*, p. 116, lines 1–4), XLIII (p. 207, line 30, through p. 208, line 6), and LXI (p. 310, line 27, through p. 311, line 1) echo the law codes.

intended the clause “swa swa geara beboden wæs Godes folce” to form part of a similar comparison. Any attempt to propose an original version of the sentence on such a hypothesis of revision is necessarily highly speculative. It is nonetheless possible on the assumption that only the phrases “syllan þone teoþan dæl ure worldspeda þe we habban” and “& we sceolan” are the products of revision, as the sentence below illustrates, in which hypothetically original words or phrases are in italics, and parentheses if they might arguably be dispensed with altogether:

> Hwæt we gehyrdon nu þæt we sceolan under þæm feowerteoþan gerime, swa swa geara beboden wæs Godes folce (*þæt hi sceoldon*) syllan þone teoþan dæl *heora* worldspeda (*þe hi hæfdon*), ure daga þone teoþan dæl on forhæfdnesse lifgean.

In this case the words “syllan þone teoþan dæl ... worldspeda” would concern the Mosaic law rather than any present obligation of an audience of Anglo-Saxons, and *Godes folc* would refer to the people of Israel rather than the members of the Christian church. The sense would be: “We have heard now that, under the number forty, just as God’s people was commanded long ago to render the tenth part of their worldly goods (that they possessed), we are to live the tenth part of our days in abstinence.” By first adducing the Mosaic tithe as an analogue and antecedent of the Lenten tithe of days, the text would then also agree with the introductions of the topic in *O* and *De ecclesiasticis officiis*. The postulated “swa swa geara beboden wæs Godes folce (þæt hi sceoldon) syllan þone teoþan dæl heora worldspeda (þe hi hæfdon)” indeed bears some resemblance to the relevant sentence in Isidore (“Lege enim Moysaica generaliter uniuerso populo est praeceptum decimas et primitias offerre domino deo”), in particular in the use of a passive construction with a verb of commanding and a dative form of the word meaning “people”: compare “beboden wæs Godes folce” to Isidore’s

"uniuerso populo est praeceptum."[43] Although it may seem overly speculative to posit an earlier version of the sentence that happens to agree with Isidore in this respect, this speculation at least has the virtue of proposing a solution to the problems in the transmitted version that have already been mentioned: *Hwæt we gehyrdon nu* can be taken at its face value, if it refers only to the necessity of practicing abstinence in Lent, and not at all to the necessity of paying a tithe of worldly goods; the phrase *under þæm feowerteoþan gerime* need not have anything to do with paying a tithe of worldly goods, but can refer merely to the Lenten tithe of days.

A motive for a revision of this kind may be tentatively advanced. The payment of tithes was not mandated for all freemen under penalty of law before the reign of Edgar, at least in a law code intended to have force throughout the whole of England.[44] It seems quite possible that the author of Blickling III had a different attitude toward the payment of tithes from that of Ælfric because he lived in an earlier period, when this payment was regarded more as a religious ideal than an obligation. It is notable that the author of Blickling IV, which is in large part an admonition to tithe based on Caesarius of Arles's *De reddendis decimis*, nonetheless shows no awareness of tithing as a legal obligation, thus seeming to betray, as Rudolph Willard thought, a conception of tithing that antedates Edgar and the Benedictine reform in England.[45] In this case, if the author of Blickling III had intended to mention the tithe of worldly goods commanded in the Mosaic law merely for the sake of analogy to the

[43] An even closer resemblance to Isidore's sentence would result if the manuscript reading *syllan* could be interpreted as an infinitive following *beboden wæs* that would correspond to Isidore's *offerre*, dependent on *est praeceptum*, but a *þæt*-clause normally follows *bebeodan* in Old English prose: thus it seems likely that *þæt hi sceoldon* should be supplied in the hypothetical original version of the sentence advanced above.

[44] Chaney, *Kingship*, pp. 237–39; Frank Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1971), p. 155.

[45] Rudolph Willard, "The Blickling-Junius Tithing Homily and Caesarius of Arles," in *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies*, ed. Thomas A. Kirby and Henry B. Woolf (Baltimore, 1949), pp. 70–71.

Lenten tithe of days (his real interest), a later reviser of the homily might have taken exception to the implication that such a tithe was a thing of the past, feeling instead that the payment of tithes required by the state in his time fell under the same divine mandate, as Ælfric clearly believed, who declared that "Godes æ us bebyt" (God's law command us) to pay a tithe of the year's produce. This reviser would then have been responsible for rewriting the sentence so as to read "we sceolan under þæm feowerteoþan gerime ... syllan þone teoþan dæl ure worldspeda," making it plain that the payment of a tithe of worldly goods was a present obligation, but inadvertently connecting it syntactically with "under þæm feowerteoþan gerime."

It might be objected that the author of *O* mentions a tithe of worldly goods in such a way that it is clear that he did not regard it as obligatory, and yet the passage that displays this lax attitude to tithing is transmitted in both Napier LV and Irvine V, despite its inconsistency with the obligation to tithe prescribed in many law codes, which Susan Irvine has well documented.[46] It seems possible, however, that such an attitude survived the Benedictine reform on the part of at least some churchmen, as Irvine suggested, while a more rigorous view was taken by others.[47] If perhaps *O* was composed before the Benedictine Reform, moreover, anachronistic sentiments in it may have survived simply because those who copied or excerpted it happened to have little interest in rewriting it critically. All that is necessary to suppose in the case of Blickling III is that a particular reviser found the sentence in the form in which it had originally been written objectionable, as seeming to neglect or even deny the obligation of "God's people" in his own time to pay a tithe of their worldly goods for the support of the church. It is hard to believe that Ælfric, for one, would have been satisfied with an allusion to the Mosaic tithe that made it seem merely a past reality: in his treatment of the

[46] Irvine, pp. 133–34.

[47] Ibid., p. 134.

Lenten tithe of days in *CH* I, XI, he simply compares it to the tithe of the year's gains enjoined by God on his audience ("Swa swa Godes æ us bebyt ...") without even mentioning the Mosaic law.[48] Where Ælfric does mention it elsewhere, in the tithing discourse preserved in CCCC 178, it is precisely as something that is continued in the obligation of his contemporaries to pay a tithe of their gains: what God commanded in the old law, according to Ælfric, he also requires in the new.[49] A reviser of Blickling III of Ælfric's time might similarly have preferred not to admit any reference to a tithe of worldly goods, unless it was made clear at the same time that just such a tithe was incumbent on his own worldly audience.

The conjecture that some kind of revision has affected the text of Blickling III, producing the problematic "Hwæt we gehyrdon nu þæt we sceolan under þæm feowerteoþan gerime ... syllan þone teoþan dæl ure worldspeda," may be entertained without supposing that the original homilist, in mentioning the Mosaic tithe, was following an Isidorean model. Yet the possibility that he, like the author of *O*, was acquainted with the section on Lent in *De ecclesiasticis officiis* should be considered. Although it seems clear that the phrase *under þæm*

[48] Ælfric similarly compares the *teoþungdagas* of Lent to the tithe of the year's produce in the *Admonitions in Lent*: "on ðam dagum sceolon cristene men heora lichaman mid forhæfednysse Gode teoðian, swa swa hi sceolon symle heora geares teolunga Gode þone teoðan dæl ... syllan" (Thorpe, ed., *Homilies*, 2:608: "in these days Christians must tithe their bodies to God with abstinence, just as they must always render the tenth part of their year's earnings to God").

[49] "God sylf bebead on þære ealdan æ, and eac manað on þære niwan, þæt ælc cristen man sceal glædlice syllan Gode his frumwæstmas, and his teoðunge ealra þæra wæstma þe him God to þam geare forgifð, and ealre þære geoguðe þe him of his orfe acenned bið, and ealra þara goda þe him God to þam geare foresceawað" (Pope XXIX, 2:806, lines 75–79: "God himself commanded in the old law, and also requires in the new, that every Christian should gladly render his first-fruits to God, and his tithe of all the fruits of the harvest that God grants him in the year, and of all the young that are born to him from his livestock, and of all the goods that God provides him in the year").

feowerteoþan gerime must refer in some way to Lent, its exact meaning is uncertain. Indeed, this instance of *gerim* is specially treated in the *Supplement* to Bosworth-Toller, where the hesitant definition "a period of a certain number of days (?)" is offered.[50] It is at least conceivable that the homilist's use of *gerim*, usually "number" or "reckoning," was inspired by Isidore's declaration (following Cassian) in his treatment of the tithe of days that in the reckoning up of Lent the sum of the tithes of the Law is fulfilled ("in supputatione ... quadragensimae summa ista legalium decimarum expletur"). The primary meaning of *quadrage(n)sima* is, of course, "fortieth," from which the meaning "Lent" is derived. Although in Old English the ordinal *feowertigoþa* was not regularly used (unlike *quadragesima*) as the name of the penitential season, the phrase *under þæm feowerteoþan gerime* might perhaps have been modelled on *in supputatione ... quadragensimae* and intended to refer similarly, if more obliquely, to Lent: the tenth part of the year that is to be lived in abstinence is found "in the count of forty," that is, in the Lenten period of forty days that is mentioned twice in the preceding numerological discussion ("þis feowertig daga," "þyssum feowertigum nihta").[51] The paradox evident in Ælfric's exposition of the tithe of days is present here too: a Lent said to last forty days is specified as the context in which a tithe of the year that constitutes only thirty-six days may be paid.

There are two minor parallels that might also connect the discussion of Lent in *De ecclesiasticis officiis* with Blickling III, although they do not concern the tithe of days

---

[50] T. Northcote Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth: Supplement* (Oxford, 1921), s.v. *ge-rím*, sense 4.

[51] It may be noted that *sicut supputatur* is glossed by *swa is gerimed* in the two major glosses on Aldhelm: see Louis Goossens, ed., *The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels, Royal Library 1650*, Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van Belgie, Klasse der Letteren 36.74. (Brussels, 1974), gloss no. 3719; Arthur S. Napier, ed., *Old English Glosses* (Oxford, 1900), no. 1, gloss no. 3832.

directly. One occurs in the numerological discussion, where the four seasons are among the things mentioned as giving significance to the number four: "swylce eac feower tida syndan on þæm geare on þæm we oft agyltað" (likewise there are also four seasons in the year in which we often transgress), which may be compared to Isidore's "mundus ... a quattuor anni temporum uicibus uariatur."[52] While the homilist might have found the four seasons mentioned in connection with the forty days of Lent elsewhere, he did not find it, at any rate, in the similar numerological discussions that he certainly knew in Gregory and in the Hiberno-Latin commentary tradition on Matthew that was his other major source.[53] The other parallel lies in the choice of the phrase *cyricena aldoras* in the sentence immediately preceding the numerological discussion ("& þa gesetton cyricena aldoras þæt fæsten foran to his þrowunga ..."),[54] which is in fact a restatement of an earlier sentence in the homily ("& þa gesetton halige fæderas & Godes folces lareowas þa tid þæs fæstenes foran to Cristes þrowunga ...") that is dependent on the Hiberno-Latin commentary tradition.[55] It is not clear why the homilist should have replaced *halige fæderas & Godes folces lareowas* with *cyricena aldoras*, an Old English adaptation of the patristic phrase *ecclesiarum principes*, but the latter might perhaps have been on his mind if he had recently noticed this Latin phrase in Isidore's remark that "the heads of the churches" established the Lenten fast ("quem ... ecclesiarum

[52] Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* 1.37.3, ed. Lawson, p. 43, lines 24–25: "the world is varied by the four seasons of the year"; Augustine (*Epistula* 55.15.28) is the ultimate source of these words.

[53] On the latter source, see Robert Getz, "More on the Sources of Blickling Homily III," *N&Q* n.s. 57 (2010), 281–90.

[54] *BH*, p. 35, lines 6–7: "And then the heads of the churches placed the fast before his passion."

[55] *BH*, p. 27, lines 22–24: "And then the holy fathers and teachers of God's people placed the time of the fast before Christ's passion." The Latin source here reads "sancti patres ieiunii tempus ad passionis … diem satis recto iudicio iunxerunt"; see Jean Rittmueller, ed., *Liber questionum in euangeliis*, CCSL 108F (Turnhout, 2003), p. 74, lines 73–74.

principes statuerunt") for the benefit of the imperfect worldly persons who might otherwise forget to practice abstinence altogether.

The several parallels, or possible parallels, to Blickling III in *De ecclesiasticis officiis* are not strong enough to infer the influence of the latter with confidence. Even if that influence is supposed, it does not amount to much as far as the actual substance of the text is concerned, which comes largely from Gregory. Yet it is hardly unlikely that the homilist, who seems to have drawn on a wide range of sources in Blickling III, should have been acquainted with a work as basic as *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, and he might naturally have perused the section on Lent before composing a homily for Quadragesima Sunday, even if he intended to derive its material from other Latin sources.[56] Isidore's words might then have influenced his composition occasionally and subtly. Whether they did so or not in the sentence that introduces the topic of the tithe of days, that sentence is problematic in the form in which it has been transmitted, and it is tempting to speculate that a reviser of a later era than the homilist altered it so as to emphasise the obligation of paying a tithe of worldly goods for the support of the church.

L2 Conclusion

Cassian's notion that the fasting-days of Lent constitute a tithe of the year was propagated by various writers in Old English, mainly through the intermediacy of the sixteenth of Gregory's *Homiliae in evangelia*. The Old English compound *teoþungdagas*, used by Ælfric, Wulfstan, and two anonymous authors, shows that this notion could sometimes be alluded to in the absence of an explanation of how the six weeks of Lent yield thirty-six days of abstinence, equaling a tenth part of the year, much as the Latin phrase *decimae anni*. The full accounts of the tithe of days provided by Ælfric, the author of Blickling III, and the homilist who

[56] On the homilist's sources, see Getz, "Sources."

composed the passages common to Irvine V and Napier LV, certainly rely on Gregory, but it is likely that the last of these also knew Isidore's adaptation, in his *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, of Cassian's explanation of the tithe of days. While these homilists all treated the tithe of days as analogous to a tithe of worldly goods, they did so in different manners. Ælfric spoke of the latter tithe simply as a duty incumbent on his audience, without even mentioning the Mosaic tithe to which Cassian had compared the new tithe of days that Christians could pay to God by the observance of Lent. The anonymous homilist whose account is preserved in Irvine V and Napier V, however, began it precisely with the Mosaic tithe, just as Cassian and Isidore, and evidently had no concern whether his audience paid tithes of a material kind or not, which he seemed to regard as a good but supererogatory practice. The brief and problematic reference to a tithe of worldly goods in Blickling III perhaps reveals an instance of revision in the homily's transmission, by someone whose attitude toward tithing was more like Ælfric's than that of the anonymous homilists.

L1 A New Analogue for Some Exegetical Motifs in Assmann Homily XIII

Esther Lemmerz

Since its publication by Bruno Assmann in 1889, the anonymous Old English homily for Holy Thursday, known as Assmann XIII, has largely been neglected by scholarship.[1] This homily (HomS 22 [CenDom 1]) survives in five manuscripts, whose dates of composition range from the beginning of the eleventh to the first half of the twelfth centuries.[2] At first glance, Assmann XIII seems to be an unremarkable address based on a standard Gospel reading for Holy Thursday (John 13:1–30).[3] The homily provides a traditional verse-by-verse exposition of the pericope; after quoting and/or translating a verse of John 13, Assmann XIII typically adds a few sentences of basic exegesis. These short exegetical passages have made it possible to identify a Latin parallel text that shares several exegetical motifs and even some direct verbal correspondences with Assmann XIII. The parallel text in question is *Sermo* 29 in Cambridge, Pembroke College 25, a manuscript containing the cycle of the so-called

---

[1] Bruno Assmann, ed., *Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben*, BaP 3 (1889; Darmstadt, repr. 1964), pp. 151–63.

[2] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 340, fols. 128r–34v (s. xi$^{in.}$); CCCC 162, pp. 333–47 (s. xi$^{in.}$); CCCC 198, fols. 166v–74v (s. xi^{2}); CCCC 302, pp. 174–82 (s. xi/xii), and London, BL, Cotton Faustina A. ix, fols. 119v–26r (s. xii^{1}). In his edition, Assmann does not include variants of CCCC 162; see Peter Clemoes's introduction to the reprinted edition of Assmann, p. xxxiii. In my analysis of Assmann XIII, I have considered all manuscript versions.

[3] Ursula Lenker, *Die westsächsische Evangelienversion und die Perikopenordnungen im angelsächsischen England*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie 20 (Munich, 1997), p. 317. Curiously, most pericopal lists either only provide the beginning but not the end of the pericope for Holy Thursday, i.e. "John 13:1– " or end with John 13:15. The only example for a homily based on John 13:1–30 is Assmann XIII itself.

Pembroke homiliary.[4] *Sermo* 29 has been transmitted in six manuscript versions, of which Pembroke 25 is the oldest.[5] James Cross has described this sermon as "an explication of John

[4] This homiliary was first mentioned by Germain Morin, *Etudes, textes, découvertes: Contributions à la littérature et à l'histoire des douze premiers siècles*, Anecdota Maredsolana. Seconde série 60 (Paris, 1913) and then described in detail by Henri Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre: Authenticité, inventaire, tableaux comparatifs, initia*, Studi e testi 225 (Vatican, 1962). Its possible role in providing basic exegisis to lay audiences has been discussed by Rosamond McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895*, Royal Historical Society Studies in History 2 (London, 1977), p. 107; Mary Clayton, "Homiliaries and Preaching in Anglo-Saxon England," in *Old English: Basic Readings*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach, Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 5 (New York; London, 2000), pp. 157–58. Its influence on Old English preaching has been demonstrated by James E. Cross, ed., *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25: A Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, KCLMS 1 (London, 1987). See also Helen L. Spencer, "Vernacular and Latin Versions of a Sermon for Lent: 'A Lost Penitential Homily' Found," *MS* 44 (1982), 271–305. The most recent study of its sources and transmission is provided by Thomas N. Hall in this volume. The University of Notre Dame made the manuscript available as a digital transcription that is unfortunately no longer accessible on the web. The transcription project run by Dot Porter and Paul Szarmach has now moved to the Schoenberg Institute (https://schoenberginstitute.org/pembroke25/ [accessed 2019 October 17]). Rebecca Rushworth contributed a detailed description of the manuscript as part of the Notre Dame project. I will refer to this manuscript as the "Pembroke homiliary."

[5] Cambridge, Pembroke College 25, fols. 63r–65v (Bury St Edmunds, s. xi/xii); Oxford, Balliol College 240, fols. 82v ff. (England, s. xiv); Cambridge, St. John's College 42, fols. 31v ff. (?Worcester, s. xii); London, BL, Royal 5. E. xix, fols. 29r ff. (Salisbury, s. $xi^{4/4}$ or $xi^{ex.}$); Grenoble, BM 278, fols. 92r ff. (Eastern France, s. xii; prov. Pierre-Châtel); Lincoln, Cathedral Library 199 (England, s. $xii^{med.}$–$xii^{3/4}$). Chartres, BM 25, fols. 119r–62r (s. x/xi, prov. Saint-Père, Chartres) was burned in 1944 and its original contents are now unknown. Older fragments, such as Canterbury, Cathedral Library and Archives, Add. 127/12 (dated to s. $x^{3/3}$ by Richard Gameson, *The Earliest Books of Canterbury Cathedral: Manuscripts and Fragments to c. 1200*, Canterbury Sources 4 [London, 2008], pp. 79–83 and Gneuss/Lapidge, no. 210) and Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Msc.Bibl.30a, recently discovered by Winfried Rudolf, "An Early Manuscript Witness of the Homiliaries of

13:1–15," followed by an extract from Caesarius's *Sermo* 202 on Holy Thursday, and an exhortation.[6]

Examining the Pembroke homiliary has led to profound insights into its sources and its compilation process and these are of great value for the study of various anonymous Old English homilies. For example, Cross demonstrated that Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI contain large portions based on several Pembroke 25 items.[7] The Ascension homily that was edited by Hildegard Tristram, too, can be traced to two items in the Pembroke manuscript.[8] Assmann XI and XII, both for Sundays in Lent, are based on Pembroke 25 items as well, as is the related item commonly known as Belfour VI.[9] Finally, Cross also identified thematic echoes in Fadda I.[10] Old English scholarship has discovered that these eight homilies were probably the work of three compilers, i.e. one was responsible for Assmann XI and Assmann XII, and Belfour VI, another for Vercelli III, and a third produced Tristram III, Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI.[11]

Angers and St. Père de Chartres in Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, MS Msc.Bibl.30a," *JML* 27 (January 2017), 1–40, do not contain *Sermo* 29.

[6] Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, p. 30.

[7] Vercelli XIX is based on items 36 and 40, see Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 96–100. Vercelli XX is based on item 93, see ibid., pp. 123–28. Vercelli XXI combines items 90, 91, and 34, see ibid., pp. 143–46.

[8] Tristram III is based on items 41 and 42, see Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 174–76.

[9] Assmann XI is based on items 20 and 21, Assmann XII is based on item 23, see Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 196–98 and 219–21. For a discussion of Belfour VI, see ibid., pp. 232–35.

[10] Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, 171–72. For a more detailed discussion of Fadda I, see also Charles D. Wright, "More Latin Sources for the Old English 'Three Utterances' Homilies," *MS* 77 (2015), 45–79.

[11] The argument for common authorship of Assmann XI, Assmann XII, Belfour VI, and Brotanek II was first made by Karl Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten 23 (Berne, 1950), pp. 178–82 and, after careful consideration, accepted by Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 232–35. Common

It is further possible that Brotanek II (a homily for the dedication of a church) was based on a Pembroke item.[12]

Sermo 29 of the Pembroke homiliary, the text which is of interest here, is, however, also connected to another collection of Latin homilies. Cross has pointed out that, apart from very few verbal variants, *Sermo* 29 in Pembroke 25 is largely identical with *Sermo* 17 in the so-called *Catechesis Celtica*.[13] The *Catechesis Celtica* is a collection of Latin homilies on Sunday Gospel readings that survives today only in one manuscript.[14] This manuscript, Codex Reginensus Latinus 49 of the Vatican Library, is commonly dated to the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century and believed to have been written in Brittany.[15] André

---

authorship of Tristram III, Vercelli XIX, XX and XXI was demonstrated by Donald Scragg, "The Compilation of the Vercelli Book," *ASE* 2 (1973), 189–207 and D. G. Scragg, "An Old English Homilist of Archbishop Dunstan's Day," in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies presented to Helmut Gneuss on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Korhammer (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 181–92; see also Paul Szarmach, "The Vercelli Homilies: Style and Structure," in *The Old English Homily and Its Backgrounds,* ed. Paul. Szarmach and Bernard F. Huppé (Albany, 1978), pp. 241–67 and Donald G. Scragg, "An Old English Homilist."

[12] Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 232–35.

[13] Ibid., *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, p. 30.

[14] Martin McNamara, "Sources and Affiliations of the *Catechesis Celtica*. (MS Vat. Reg. lat. 49)," *SE* 34 (January 1994), 185–86.

[15] Wilmart admits to the difficulty of precisely dating the manuscript and suggests the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century (see his *Analecta Reginensia: Extraits des manuscrits latins de la reine Christi conservés au Vatican*, Studi e testi 59 [Vatican, 1933], 29). Wilmart prefers Brittany as the manuscript's place of origin although he thinks that Cornwall, Wales, and Fleury-sur-Loire were possible; see also J. Loth, "Une glose brittone inédite du IXe–Xe siècle: une autre origine douteuse," *Revue Celitique* 5 (1933), 357–62. Jean Rittmueller, ed., *Liber questionvm in euangeliis*, CCSL 108F (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 67–79 dates the manuscript to the tenth century on palaeographical grounds and provides "Brittany?" as its provenance. Michael Lapidge and Richard Sharpe (BCLL 974) date the manuscript to the turn of the ninth to the tenth centuries; they, too, locate its origin in Brittany. The same date and provenance are provided by Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 6608 and

Wilmart first named the collection and partially edited the manuscript in 1933.[16] Since Wilmart's edition, scholars have continually added to his discussion of the manuscript.[17]

The *Catechesis Celtica* occupies a prominent place in Old English source studies. Several Old English homilies have been shown to draw from this collection. For example, Vercelli V and VI borrow their Portents of Christ's Birth from the *Catechesis Celtica*.[18] Vercelli IX shares its Five Prefigurations of Hell with this collection[19] and the Seven Joys of Heaven motif influenced Vercelli IX, XIX, and the Old English poem *Christ III* of the Exeter

---

Bernhard Bischoff, "Turning-Points in the History of Latin Exegesis in the Early Middle Ages," trans. Colm O'Grady, in *Biblical Studies: The Medieval Irish Contribution*, ed. Martin McNamara, Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association (Dublin, 1976), p. 82.

[16] Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*.

[17] Robert McNally, "Der Irische *Liber de Numeri*s: Eine Quellenalyse des pseudo-isidorischen *Liber de Numeris*" (PhD diss., University of Munich, 1957) provided a detailed analysis of the sources of the *Catechesis Celtica*. His work was considerably expanded by McNamara, "Sources and Affiliations" and Diarmuid Ó Laoghaire, "Irish Elements in the Catechesis Celtica," in *Irland und die Christenheit: Bibelstudien und Mission*, ed. Próinséas NíChatháin and Michael Richter, Veröffentlichungen des Europa-Zentrums Tübingen. Kulturwissenschaftliche Reihe 3 (Stuttgart, 1987), pp. 146–64; The collection's relationship to the *Liber questionum in euangeliis* was untangled by Jean Rittmueller, *Liber questionum* and her article "MS Vat. Reg. 49 Reviewed: A New Description and a Table of Textual Parallels with the *Liber Questionum in Euangeliis*," *SE* 33 (1992), 259–305.

[18] J. E. Cross, "Portents and Events at Christ's Birth: Comments on Vercelli V and VI and the Old English Martyrology," *ASE* 2 (1973), 209–20. See also Thomas N. Hall, "The Portents at Christ's Birth in Vercelli Homilies V and VI: Some Analogues from Medieval Sources and Biblical Commentaries," in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, TASS 4 (Toronto, 2009), pp. 62–97.

[19] David F. Johnson, "The Five Horrors of Hell: An Insular Homiletic Motif," *ES* 74, no. 5 (1993), 414–31.

Book.[20] Moreover, Charles D. Wright cites the collection as a possible source for some passages in Blickling homily III.[21]

For the remainder of this paper, I will focus on Assmann XIII and aim to show that this Old English homily shares several motifs and verbal parallels with *Sermo* 29 in the Pembroke homiliary and the corresponding *Sermo* 17 in the *Catechesis Celtica*. Interestingly, the parallels between Assmann XIII and *Sermo* 29 are limited to the first half of either homily, i.e. their explanation of John 13:1–15.[22] *Sermo* 29 then continues with extracts from Caesarius[23], while Assmann XIII follows John 13:18–30 and treats Judas's betrayal at length.[24] For the sake of cohesion, I have taken liberty to select only the most suggestive correspondences for my discussion.

After their respective introductory passages, both *Sermo* 29 and Assmann XIII quote and interpret the story of Christ washing his disciples' feet that is part of Christ's last supper in the Gospel of John. Both texts connect Christ's putting aside his clothing at the beginning of the episode in John 13 to him coming down from heaven.

---

[20] Thomas D. Hill, "The Seven Joys of Heaven in 'Christ III' and Old English Homiletic Texts," *N&Q* n.s. 16, no. 5 (1969), 165–66; *VH*, pp. 151–52. Frederick M. Biggs, "The Fourfold Division of Souls: The Old English "Christ III" and the Insular Homiletic Tradition," *Traditio* 45 (1990), 35–51. For the "Seven Joys of Heaven" in Vercelli XIX, see also Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, p. 99.

[21] Charles D. Wright, "Blickling Homily III on the Temptations in the Desert," *Anglia* 106 (1988), 131–37.

[22] Pembroke 25, fols. 63v/1–64v/20; see Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, p. 30; and Assmann XIII, lines 1–181.

[23] Pembroke 25, fols. 64v/20–65r/18; see Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, p. 30.

[24] Assmann XIII, lines 200–61.

Pembroke 25: Sicut in euangelio scriptum est: Cum surrexisset *a caena,* Dominus deposuit *uestimenta sua* (cf. John 13:4).[25] Id est, **cum descendisset de caelestibus**, expoliauit se suis uestimentis, formam serui induens, ***et praecinxit se lint'h'eo*** (cf. John 13:4b). **Id est, induit se uestimentis nostrae mortalitatis.**[26]

Assmann XIII: *Et quia a Deo exivit et ad Deum vadit* (John 13:3), And he wiste, **þæt he fram godfæder on middaneard asended wæs** and þætte he eft to godfæder feran wolde. Soðlice þeah ðe he drihten us hider on middaneard eadmodlice gesohte on menniscne lichaman, hwæðere swa þeah he englas blissode on heofona rice and him þær wuldre and gefean heold. And þeah ðe he eft of ðysum middanearde to godfæder on heofonas ferde, hwæðere he her on worulde mid his gecorenum wunað, forðan his mihte synt, þæt he æghwær sy and he þurh his godcundnysse æghwær andweard bið. *Surgit a cena et posuit vestimenta sua*, (John 13:4a) He ða aras se hælend, cwæð þa se godspellere, fram þam gecorenum and his hrægl asette. He cwæð, þæt he his hrægl asette. He mænde, þæt he hit on anre stowe alede. Mid þy he getacnode, þæt he wolde his þone halgan lichaman on deað gesettan for ealles mancynnes hælu. He hwæðere eft þone ilcan lichaman swiðe wlitigne and wundorlicne gefremede þurh his þa halgan ærist.

---

[25] I wish to thank Thomas N. Hall for generously providing me with his latest unpublished transcript and translation of the homily. Italics highlight biblical correspondences, those between the Latin and the Old English are highlighted in bold type.

[26] Pembroke 25, fol. 63v/14–18: "As it is written in the Gospel: when he had risen *from the meal*, the Lord laid aside *his garments*. That is, when he descended from the heavens, he removed his garments, clothing himself in the form of a servant, *and girded himself with a towel*. That is, he clothed himself with the vestments of our mortality." (trans. throughout this article by Hall, 2019).

> ***Et cum accepisset linteum, praecinxit se*** (John 13:4b). He ða **onfeng line and hine mid begyrde**, þæt is, þæt he onfeng þære mæstan strengðu, mid þære he þysne middaneard alysde. And we eac witan, þæt þæt bið þegnes riht, þonne he wile teala þenian, þæt he hine sceal to ðan **gyrdan and gearwian**, þæt he mæge oðrum mannum gedafenlice þenian. To ðan se heofonlica cyning ælmihtig god **us hider on middaneard gesohte on menniscum lichaman**, þæt he us wolde þurh his tocyme ece lif þenian and forgeofan, swa he gedyde þurh his þa halgan þrowunge and þurh his þa eadmodan lare, þe he mancynne her on middanearde sæde and cydde.[27]

While *Sermo* 29 interprets John 13:4 as Christ coming down from heaven, Assmann XIII shares the motif but attributes it to the preceding phrase. Both homilies connect the respective

[27] Assmann XIII, lines 76–101: "And that he had come from God and went to God, and he knew that he had been send into the world from God the Father and that he would return again to God the Father. Truly, although the Lord humbly sought us here on earth in a human body, he nevertheless rejoiced with the angels in the heavenly kingdom and there he preserves them in glory and joy. And although he again returned from this world to God the Father, he nevertheless lives here in this world with his chosen ones because they are his powers so that he might be anywhere and so that through his divinity he might be present anywhere. He rose from the meal and laid aside his clothes. Then the Saviour arose, says the evangelist, from his chosen ones and set aside his clothes. He said that he set aside his clothes. He meant that he put them down in a place. By this he indicated that he wished to place his holy body into death for the salvation of all humankind. He nevertheless made the same body again very beautiful and wonderful through his holy resurrection. And after he received the cloth, he girded himself. He then received the linen and girded himself with it, that is, that he received the greatest strength by means of which he redeemed the world. And we also know that it is the servant's right when he wishes to serve correctly, that he has to gird himself and make himself ready for them so that he might be able to serve other people in a fitting matter. Therefore, the heavenly king, almighty God, sought us here on earth in a human body so that he would serve us and give us eternal life through his coming as he did through his holy suffering and through his mild teaching that he said and made known to humanity here on earth."

verses of John 13 to Christ's coming down from heaven, but only *Sermo* 29 explicitly interprets the pericope verse as Christ putting on a human body as a garment.[28] Assmann XIII, in contrast seems to suggest that Christ is setting aside his human body when he sets aside his clothes. The homilist interprets Christ's setting aside his clothes in John 13:4a as him placing his body into death for the salvation of humankind. While *Sermo* 29 focuses on Christ putting on a human body when he descended from heaven, Assmann homily XIII suggests that he put aside this human body. Despite their different interpretative strategies, both *Sermo* 29 and Assmann XIII make use of the clothing motif and interpret Christ's human body as clothing that he puts on or sets aside.

[28] This motif seems to be based on Philippians 2:5–7. The earliest explicit connection of Christ taking on a human body as clothing can be found in Augustine's, *Sermones ad populum*, i.e., in *Sermo* 341, p. 564, lines 278–79, ed. François Dolbeau, *Vingt-Six Sermons Au Peuple d'Afrique*, 2nd revised and corrected edition, Collection Des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquités 147 (Paris, 2009); *Sermo* 215, 22, line 91, ed. Patrick Verbraken, "Les sermons CCXV et LVI de saint Augustin. 'De symbolo' et 'De oratione dominica'," *RB* 68 (1958); *Sermo* 6, p. 65, line 108, ed. Cyrille Lambot, *Sancti Avrelii Avgvstini Sermones de Vetere Testamento: Id Est Sermones I–L Secvndvm Ordinem Vvlgatvm Insertis Etiam Novem Sermonibvs Post Maurinos Repertis*, CCSL 41 (Turnhout, 1961); in Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, Psalm 49, par. 19, line 11, ed. Eligius Dekkers, *Sancti Avrelii Avgvstini Enarrationes in psalmos, I–L*, CCSL 39 (Turnhout, 1956). The motif can also be found in Fulgentius Ruspensis, *Epistula 17*, ch. 16, line 403, ed. Jean Fraipont, *Sancti Fvlgentii Episcopi Rvspensis Opera*, CCSL 91A (Turnhout, 1968), in the anonymous *Preface to the Minor Prophets*, 7.11, p. 146, line 11, ed. D. de Bruyne, *Prefaces to the Latin Bible*, Studia Traditionis Theologiae (Turnhout, 2015 [= reprint of 1920]), and *Homily* 51 in the fifth-century *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, 43.925, line 76, ed. Raymond Étaix, "Fragments inédits de l' 'Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum'," *RB* 84 (1974). A similarity search in the *Library of Latin Texts* did not yield any results for "uestitus humanitas," "indumentum mortalitas," "uestimentum mortalitas," or "uvestimentum humanitas."

Moreover, *Sermo* 29 and Assmann XIII both use the complementary motif, i.e. of Jesus assuming a heavenly body as a new vestment after his resurrection.[29]

Pembroke 25: ***Postquam*** **autem** ***lauit pedes eorum, accepit uestimenta sua*** (John 13:12a). Id est, post ***effusionem sanguinis*** pro nobis, *tertia die de sepulchro resurgens* in *eodem corpore quo moriebatur in cruce, immortalis factus*, **caelestibus indutus est uestimentis**.[30]

Assmann XIII: ***Postquam ergo lavit pedes eorum*** **(John 13:12a). Æfterþan þe se hælend þa hæfde heora fet geþwagen, þa onfeng he eft his hrægle and hine mid gegerede.** On ðam wæs getacnod, þæt æfterþam þe he ure drihten for ealles mancynnes hælu lichamlice deað geðrowade and he þysne middaneard aðwoh and generede **mid his þy deorwurðan blode**, þæt **he þa eft onfeng his þam unwæmman gegerelan, þæt is**

[29] This motif, too, is based on Philippians 2:5–7 and was explicitly connected to clothing by commentators on this New Testament passage, e.g. by Augustine, *Sermo* 299*,* par. 9 (ed. F. Dolbeau, "Deux sermons d'Augustin pour les fêtes de Jean-Baptiste et de Pierre et Paul [s. 293 et 299]," *Augustinianum* 57 [2017], 403–92), and was reused in the ninth century by Florus of Lyon (see, Paul-Irénée Fransen, ed., *In Epistolam secvndam ad Corinthios, in Epistolas ad Galatas, Ephesios et Philippenses*, CCCM 220B [Turnhout: Brepols, 2011], 72, line 14). The motif is also present in the commentaries by the fourth-century theologian Marius Victorinus, (see Albrecht Locher, ed., *Marii Victorini Afri Commentarii in Epistulas Pauli ad Galatas ad Philippenses ad Ephesios*, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana [Leipzig, 1972], 3.21, line 14) and the ninth-century bishop Claudius of Turin, (see Cristina Ricci, ed. *Clavdii Tavrinensis Tractatvs in Epistola ad Ephesios*, CCCM 263 [Turnhout, 2014], 3.21, line 1).

[30] Pembroke 25, fol. 64v/5–9: "And *then after he had washed their feet, he took up his garments*. That is, after pouring out his blood for us and rising again from the sepulchre on the third day in the same body in which he died on the cross, made immortal, he clothed himself with celestial garments."

> **his þam halgan lichaman**, þe he ær for manna hælu on ðrowade, þone he eft wundorlicne and undeadlicne gefremede þurh his þa halgan ærist.[31]

Both homilies quote a version of John 13:12 and share the interpretation that follows the pericope verse. They both characterise Christ's death as him shedding blood for humanity: *Sermo* 29 states "post effusionem sanguinis pro nobis" and Assmann XIII has the clause "he þysne middaneard aðwoh and generede mid his þy deorwurðan blode" that emphasises the soteriological effect of Christ's shedding blood. The two homilies also interpret the resurrection as Christ receiving a new, heavenly garment. While *Sermo* 29 calls this new clothing "caelestibus […] uestimentis" (celestial garment), Assmann XIII refers to it as "unwæmman gegerelan" (unblemished garment). To this shared motif, Assmann XIII adds an explanatory clause ("þæt is his þam halgan lichaman") that more explicitly equates the celestial garment with Christ's new body and connects this passage to its counterpart that focuses on Christ assuming a human body when he came down from heaven.

It is noteworthy that the two clothing motifs occur at the beginning and at the end of the string of comparable passages in *Sermo* 29 and Assmann XIII. While it is not surprising that (composite) homilies are more unstable at beginnings and endings, the fact that Assmann XIII incorporates both of the interconnected motifs might hint at the homilist's deliberate selection from a text similar to *Sermo* 29.

---

[31] Assmann XIII, lines 169–77: "After the Saviour had washed their feet, he received his clothes again and girded himself with them. By this was signified that after our Lord had suffered physical death for the salvation of all humankind and he had washed this world and redeemed it with his precious blood, he again received his spotless clothing, that is, his holy body, by means of which he earlier suffered for the salvation of men, and which he again made wonderful and undying through his holy resurrection."

Both Assmann XIII and *Sermo* 29 connect the feet washing episode in John 13 to the sacrament of baptism. This interpretation was based on Augustine and became popular among early medieval homilists such as Bede, Alcuin, or Haymo.[32]

Pembroke 25: **Et *dixit ei Iesus: Qui lotus est non habet opus nisi tantum lauare pedes*** (cf. John 13:10ab). Lauatur quidem unusquisque *in* ***lauacro sancti baptismatis***.[33]

Assmann XIII: **Þa cwæð he Crist to him: Se man, se ðe aþwægen bið, ne bið him þæs þearf, þæt hine man eft þwea, ac he þonne bið eall clæne** (John 13:10). Hwæt mænde he drihten on ðam wordum? Hwæt, we witan, þæt ne bið ænig man to ðæs clæne aðwægen, þæt he þæs hwæðere næbbe þearfe, þæt he hine eft þwea. Ac he mænde, swa ic ær cwæð, þa gastlican onþwægennysse, þæt is **þæt halige fulwihtes bæð** and synna forlætennysse, forðan se man, se ðe rihtlice gefulwad bið, se bið eall clæne. Ne sceal hine man eft fulwian, ne þæt alefed nis.[34]

---

[32] Jörg Sonntag, *Klosterleben im Spiegel des Zeichenhaften: Symbolisches Denken und Handeln hochmittelalterlicher Mönche zwischen Dauer und Wandel, Regel und Gewohnheit*, Vita Regularis, Abhandlungen 35 (Berlin, 2008), p. 337.

[33] Pembroke 25, fol. 64r/28–30: "And Jesus said to him: 'He who is washed need only wash his feet.' Indeed, each one is washed in the bath of holy baptism ... ."

[34] Assmann XIII, lines 148–56: "Then Christ said to him: 'The person who is washed does not need it to be washed again but shall be entirely clean.' What did the Lord mean by these words? Listen, we know that there is no one who is washed this clean that they do not nevertheless need to be washed again. And he meant, as I said earlier, the spiritual cleansing that is the holy bath of baptism and the forgiveness of sins because the person, who has been baptised correctly, will be entirely clean. They must not be baptised again as this is not permitted."

Sermo 29 quotes John 13:10 while Assmann XIII translates the verse into Old English without quoting the Latin directly. Both homilies use a similar phrase in connecting this verse to the sacrament of baptism: The phrase "lauacro sancti baptismatis" in *Sermo* 29 closely corresponds to "halige fulwihtes bæð" in Assmann XIII. The only difference between the Latin and the Old English phrases is the referent of the adjective. In *Sermo* 29 the attribute "holy" modifies baptism, whereas in Assmann XIII it modifies "bath."[35]

While the previously discussed parallels between *Sermo* 29 and Assmann XIII have revealed shared motifs and occasional verbal echoes in single phrases, Assmann XIII also contains close verbal parallels to *Sermo* 29 on the sentence level. These parallels appear in the homilies' depiction of Jesus washing Peter's feet and their interpretation of the relevant verses from John 13.

> Pembroke 25: ***Venit ergo ad Simonem Petrum*** (John 13:6a). *Non ita tamen intelligendum est*, fratres, quod post ceteros ad eum uenerit *quasi aliquibus* iam *lauisset pedes*, **sed quod ab illo *primum ceperit*, quia ipse erat uenturus primus et princeps apostolorum.**[36]
>
> Assmann XIII: **Venit ergo ad Simonem Petrum (John 13:6a), He ða com to his ðegne, þe Petrus wæs gehaten.** Næs na, þæt he latost to him come, **ac he ealra ærest**

[35] While Assmann XIII stresses that baptism can be performed only once, this regulation is absent from *Sermo* 29.

[36] Pembroke 25, fol. 64r, lines 9–13: "*He came therefore to Simon Peter*. Nevertheless, brothers, we should not think that he came to him after the others as if He had already washed everyone else's feet, but that He began with him first, because he was about to become the foremost and prince of the apostles."

to him eode, and he ærest æt him ongan heora fet þwean, forðan ðe he wæs þæra apostola ealdorman.[37]

Both *Sermo* 29 and Assmann XIII quote John 13:6 and subsequently interpret the verse. In this example, even the wording of the two homilies is strikingly similar. In the first sentence following the pericope verse, both homilies insist that Jesus washed Peter's feet first and they both state this in a sentence that begins with a negative followed by a relative clause. *Sermo* 29 begins this sentence with "non ita tamen intelligendum est" (literally: "it is nevertheless not to be understood that …"), while Assmann XIII uses the simpler, but equally negative, construction "Næs na, þæt …" (It is not that …).[38] Even more fascinating is the second sentence that follows the pericope verse. The corresponding sentences in Assmann XIII and *Sermo* 29 agree almost verbatim. Both sentences start with a concessive clause that is introduced by Lat. *sed* / OE *ac*. In this clause, both *Sermo* 29 and Assmann XIII stress that Christ came to Peter first. Here, except for the genitive *ealra*, the clause in Assmann XIII ("ac he ealra ærest to him eode") is a perfect parallel to the corresponding clause in *Sermo* 29 ("Sed quod ab illo primum ceperit"). Furthermore, both homilies provide the same reason for Christ starting with Peter, i.e. because he was the prince of the apostles. Both explanatory clauses are introduced by a causal conjunction (Lat. *quia* / OE *forðam*) followed by a pronoun referring to Peter (Lat. *ipse* / OE *he*), a form of to be, and the epithet for Peter (Lat. *primus et princeps apostolorum* / OE *þæra apostola ealdorman*). There is, however, a subtle difference

[37] Assmann XIII, lines 110–14: "*He then came to Simon Peter.* He then came to his disciple who was named Peter. It is not so that he came to him last but he went to him first of all and he began with him first to wash their feet because he was the prince of the apostles."

[38] Bodley 340, CCCC 302 and Faustina A. ix have the double negation "næs na" while CCCC 162 and CCCC 198 have the slightly more emphatic "nalæs" (not at all).

between epithets used by the homilies: with "primus et princeps apostolorum" *Sermo* 29 uses a noun phrase that not only alliterates but is also so unusual in the corpus of medieval Latin Bible interpretation that the only other text in which it can be found is Boniface's *Epistola* 129.[39] Assmann XIII, in turn, does not have an equivalent to "primus" but uses the phrase "þæra apostola ealdorman" that corresponds to the more common "princeps apostolorum."[40]

Sermo 29 and Assmann XIII also agree in how they render Peter's reaction to Christ's attempt to wash his feet:

> Pembroke 25: **et dixit: *Domine tu mihi lauas pedes?*** (John 13:6c). **Ac si dixisset**: "*Tu Deus, ego homo. Tu Dominus, ego seruus. Tu Redemptor, ego peccator*. **Et ideo non decet ut *mihi lauas pedes***" (John 13:6c).[41]

[39] Boniface, *Epist*. 129, ed. Michael Tangl, *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, 2nd ed., MGH Epistolae Selectae 1 (Berlin, 1955), p. 267, line 13: "beatus Petrus primus et princeps apostolorum." I wish to thank Thomas N. Hall for drawing my attention to this letter.

[40] The Library of Latin texts indicates that the earliest uses of the phrase *princeps apostolorum* can be found in the works of Faustinus, Jerome, Augustine, John Cassian, and Salvianus in the fifth (and, in case of Faustinus's and Jerome's earlier works, the late fourth) century. See, for example, Faustinus Luficerianus, *De trinitate*, 40, line 4, eds. Grégoire, Otto Gunther, Manlio Simonetti, and Vincent Bulhart, *Gregorius Iliberritanus, Faustinus Luciferianus*, CCSL 69, (Turnhout, 1967); Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, 1.6, line 22, ed. Claudia Barthold, *De viris illustribus, Berühmte Männer*, 2nd ed., Sammlung Tusculum (Mülheim, 2011); Augustine, *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus*, 89.1, line 31, ed. Radbodus Willems, *Aurelii Augustini Opera, pars VIII*, 2nd edition, CCSL 36 (Turnhout, 1990).

[41] Pembroke 25, fol. 64r, lines 16–19. Translation: "and he said: '*Lord, do you wash my feet*?' But it's as if he had said: 'You are God, I am a man. You are the Lord, I am a servant. You are the Redeemer, I am a sinner. And so it is not fitting that you wash my feet.'"

> Assmann XIII: **Þa cwæð he Petrus to him: Hu mæg þæt, min drihten, swa beon, þæt þu mine fet þwea?** (John 13:6) **Efne swa swa he cwæde**: Ic eom þurh mine tydderlice gecynd lichamlic man and þu eart ece god ealra gesceafta. **Nis þæt forðan gedafenlic, þæt þu to minum fotum onhnige.**[42]

First *Sermo* 29 quotes John 13:6c and Assmann XIII translates the same Gospel passage into Old English. Still, the interpretation that follows does not have a direct parallel in the Gospel passage.[43] Both homilies use a similar phrase to introduce their interpretation. The phrase "Ac sí dixisset"[44] in *Sermo* 29 has an almost exact parallel in Assmann XIII, "Efne swa swa he cwæde." Both phrases agree not only in their word order but also in their use of the subjunctive. This phrase occurs three times in Assmann XIII and once in both Vercelli XVI and HomS 25. In all three instances in Assmann XIII, this phrase introduces the homily's interpretation of a Gospel verse.[45] Interestingly, both Vercelli XVI and HomS 25 use the phrase in the same manner. In Vercelli XVI it introduces the homily's interpretation of Jesus

---

[42] Assmann XIII, lines 121–24: "Then Peter said to him: 'How can this be, my Lord, that you wash my feet?' Just as if he had said: 'I am a corporeal man due to my weak nature and you are the eternal God of all creation. This is therefore not fitting that you bend down to my feet.'"

[43] In the Gospel of John, Peter's question "'Domine, tu mihi lavas pedes?'" ('Lord, do you wash my feet?' John 13:6) is immediately followed by Jesus's response "Respondit Jesus, et dixit ei: 'Quod ego facio, tu nescis modo: scies autem postea.'" (Jesus answered and said to him: 'You do not understand what I do but you shall understand later.' John 13:7). Peter then does try to reject Jesus's plan to wash his feet but his wording differs considerably from either homily: "Dicit ei Petrus: 'Non lavabis mihi pedes in æternum.'" (Peter said to him: 'You will never wash my feet.' John 13:8a).

[44] Hall identifies this phrase as one of the Pembroke 25 compiler's stylistic features; see Thomas N. Hall, article in this volume, 000, n. 21.

[45] The other two occurrences in Assmann XIII are lines 144–48 and lines 202–8.

being baptised by John[46] and in HomS 25 it precedes the text's interpretation of Gabriel's greeting to Mary.[47] The use of this specific phrase in Vercelli XVI and HomS 25 not only suggests a connection between the three homilies but also implies that Vercelli XVI and HomS 25 might, too, be connected to the Pembroke homiliary.[48]

The first sentence of the actual interpretation agrees in theme but not in wording. While *Sermo* 29 provides a concise list of antitheses, Assmann XIII only uses the man-God antithesis but bolsters these contrasting nouns with adjectives and genitive constructions. In the following sentences, however, the two homilies agree again almost verbatim in their reasoning why Peter does not want Christ to wash his feet. Both sentences begin with a negative impersonal *decet*-clause ("non decet" and "nis gedafenlic") followed by a purpose clause ("ut mihi lauas pedes" and "þæt þu to minum fotum onhnige"). They even agree in their use of the adverb Lat. *ideo* / OE *forðan* in the main-clause. Moreover, a corpus search in the *Library of Latin Texts* for passages that comment on John 13:6 reveals that *Sermo* 29 is unique in sharing the second interpretive sentence with Assmann XIII. For example, Alcuin's and Augustine's commentaries on John do not contain any equivalent to the sentence "Et ideo non decet ut mihi lauas pedes" in *Sermo* 29.[49] Similarly, a search in the *DOE Corpus* reveals

---

[46] *VH*, pp. 267–74, lines 24–28.

[47] Bodley 340, fol. 150r, lines 5–11, see also *DOE Web Corpus*, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey, with John Price Wilkin and Xin Xiang, transcript from Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 340.

[48] Thomas N. Hall, "The Reversal of the Jordan in Vercelli Homily 16 and in Old English Literature," *Traditio* 45 (1990), 53–86, has demonstrated that Vercelli XVI is connected to the *Catechesis Celtica* in so far as the topic of the Jordan's reversal can be found in two texts of the Hiberno-Latin tradition, namely, the *Catechesis Celtica* and the Irish Pseudo-Jerome (60–61). However, Hall stresses that neither is a direct source for Vercelli XVI (64).

[49] Alcuin, *Commentaria in sancti Iohannis Euangelium*, PL 100:925; Augustine, *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus*, ed. Radbodus Willems (Turnhout, 1954), 56.1, line 17.

that the Old English translation, *nis þæt forðan gedafenlic*, is unique to Assmann XIII. The more common phrase *nis na gedafenlic* occurs four times in the corpus but does not contain the OE adverb *forðan* that corresponds to Lat. *ideo* in *Sermo* 29.[50] These search results, combined with the previously discussed close verbal parallels, make it likely that this passage in Assmann XIII is indeed based on a homily similar to *Sermo* 29.

These selected examples have so far demonstrated that *Sermo* 29 in Pembroke 25 and Assmann XIII share several motifs and, what is equally important, even agree in the sequence of these motifs. Moreover, Assmann XIII has striking verbal parallels to *Sermo* 29 in its interpretation of John 13:6 that cannot be found in other commentaries on the same passage or in other homilies in the Old English corpus. Although *Sermo* 29 is certainly not a direct source for the entire Assmann XIII homily, it definitely provides a close parallel for parts of the first half of Assmann XIII.

L2 The Source Conundrum

Despite these parallels, the question remains, which is the likeliest explanation for the correspondences between *Sermo* 29 and Assmann XIII: Did the Assmann XIII homilist know a version of the Pembroke homiliary? Or was the homilist familiar with the *Catechesis Celtica* independent of the Pembroke collection? Would the homilist have known only *Sermo* 29 or a few of its compositional units? Based on these questions, further difficulties arise. Should Assmann XIII be added to the group of anonymous Old English homilies that are based on the Pembroke homiliary, such as Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI, Tristram III, and

[50] *CH* I, I, p. 181, line 86; XXVI, p. 394, line 178; XXVIII, p. 411, line 49; and Hugh Magennis, ed., *The Old English Life of Saint Mary of Egypt: An Edition of the Old English Text with Modern English Parallel-Text Translation*, Exeter Medieval Texts and Studies (Exeter, 2002), line 490.

Assmann XI and XII? Or does Assmann XIII perhaps belong with Vercelli V, VI, IX, XIX, and *Christ III* that share motifs with the *Catechesis Celtica*?

When trying to answer this question, it is useful first to compare the manuscript evidence of the potential Latin sources. Unfortunately, *Sermo* 17 *In cena Domini* homily in the *Catechesis Celtica* does not differ at all from *Sermo* 29 in the Pembroke homiliary in any of the previously discussed passages. In a next step, one might consider the relationship between the two Latin collections. McNamara has pointed out that the *In cena Domini* homily contains peculiarities not found in the other homilies in the *Catechesis Celtica*.[51] His own linguistic analysis and Jean Rittmueller's comparison of the Vatican manuscript Reg. lat. 49 to both Pembroke 25 and the *Liber questionum in Evangeliis*, an Irish commentary on Matthew that draws on a variety of patristic and early medieval sources, have led McNamara to conclude that *Sermo* 29 was borrowed "directly by the *Catechesis Celtica* collection from a Carolingian Homiliarium."[52] However, this does not help us in deciding if the Assmann XIII homilist was drawing from the Pembroke 25 homiliary or directly from the *Catechesis Celtica*.

The manuscript contexts of Assmann XIII, however, might provide a few clues. In terms of transmission history, the books containing Assmann XIII fall, broadly speaking, into two groups: the first of these are the two younger witnesses, CCCC 302 and Faustina A. ix. In both manuscripts, Assmann XIII occurs together with HomS 5 (Willard), Assmann XIV, and

---

[51] McNamara, "Sources and Affiliations," 192 and Martin McNamara, "Irish Homilies A.D. 600–1100, " in *Via Crucis: Essays on Early Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross*, ed. Thomas N. Hall, Medieval European Studies 1 (Morgantown, 2002), p. 270.

[52] McNamara, "Sources and Affiliations," 192–93; Jean Rittmueller, "MS Vat. Reg. 49 Reviewed: A New Description and a Table of Textual Parallels with the *Liber Questionum in Euangeliis*," *SE* 33 (1992), 259–305 and Jean Rittmueller, *Liber questionum in euangeliis*.

Napier XLIX.[53] Donald Scragg has shown that in Faustina A. ix the anonymous pieces occur in two blocks: Ker's arts. 4 (HomS 5 (Willard)), 5 (Assmann XIV), and 6 (variant of Napier XLIX / HomS 7) are for "the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Sundays after Epiphany (or *quando volueris*)."[54] Art. 23 (part of Blickling VI) and 24 (Assmann XIII) are for Holy Week.[55]

Ker number	**Folios**	**Occasion**	**Conventional title or *DOE* short title**
153.04	21v–23v	Third Sunday after Epiphany	HomS 5 (Willard)
153.05	23v–27v	Fourth Sunday after Epiphany	Assmann XIV
153.06	27v–31v	Fifth Sunday after Epiphany	variant of Napier XLIX / HomS 7
153.07–22	31v–116v	*Sixteen Ælfrician homilies, including homilies for Palm Sunday and Easter*	
153.23	116v–19v	–	part of Blickling VI
153.24	119v–26	Holy Thursday	Assmann XIII

Table 1: Partial Table of Contents of Faustina A. ix

Scragg has demonstrated that CCCC 302 is very close to Faustina A. ix with which it shares all but one of the anonymous homilies. Scragg carefully suggests that both manuscripts share "a number of spellings in both Ælfrician and anonymous material that point to the Southeast, so that it is reasonable to conclude that a southeastern manuscript formed part of their

[53] CCCC 302 also contains Tristram IV, while Faustina A. ix adds a part of Blickling VI and a homiletic piece that brings together WHom 9 and ÆHom 20.

[54] Scragg, "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric," *ASE* 8 (1979), 245.

[55] Ibid.

pedigree at not too great a distance from them."[56] These southeastern connections could link these manuscripts to Canterbury, whose geographical closeness to the Carolingian Empire and pivotal role in the Benedictine Reform might account for knowledge of both the *Catechesis Celtica* or the Pembroke homiliary.

Ker number	**Folios**	**Occasion**	**Conventional title or *DOE* short title**
56.10	pp. 71–73	–	HomS 5 (Willard)
56.11	pp. 73–78	Fourth Sunday after Epiphany	Assmann XIV
56.12	pp. 78–83	Fifth Sunday after Epiphany	Napier XLIX, pp. 257, line 9–265.
56.13–26	pp. 83–173	*Fourteen Ælfrician homilies, including one for Palm Sunday*	
56.27	pp. 174–82	Holy Thursday	Assmann XIII
56.28–30	pp. 182–205	*Three Ælfrician homilies, including one for Easter*	
56.31	pp. 205–13	Monday in Rogationtide	Tristram IV
56.32	pp. 213–21	*Tuesday in Rogationtide*	*Ælfric, CH I, XIX*
56.33	pp. 221–30	Tuesday in Rogationtide	Napier XLIX

Table 2: Partial Table of Contents of CCCC 302

In both Faustina A. ix and CCCC 302 Assmann XIII is part of a minimal Holy Week group that provides preaching material for Palm Sunday, Holy Thursday and Easter but not for Good Friday or Holy Saturday. None of the other anonymous homilies in these two manuscripts, however, are connected to either the Pembroke homiliary or the *Catechesis Celtica*.

[56] Ibid., p. 246.

The second group consists of the three early manuscripts, CCCC 162, CCCC 198, and Bodley 340. In these codices Assmann XIII occurs in the *Temporale* sequence as part of a group of homilies for Holy Week, namely, HomS 18 (for Palm Sunday), Vercelli I (for Good Friday), and HomS 25 (for Holy Saturday). Interestingly, three of the homilies in this cluster (Assmann XIII, Vercelli I, and HomS 25) provide preaching material for the so-called Silent Days on which Ælfric of Eynsham strictly forbade preaching.[57]

In Bodley 340, the anonymous homilies are inserted into the Ælfrician material at three points, i.e. Vercelli V at the beginning, Vercelli VIII and IX after Epiphany, and a group of eight anonymous pieces after the First Sunday in Lent (Vercelli III, Assmann XI, Belfour VI, Assmann XII, HomS 18, Assmann XIII, Vercelli I, and HomS 25).[58] These three homilies for Holy Week are preceded by an anonymous homily for Palm Sunday, HomS 18, which replaces Ælfric's homilies for the same day.[59] Scragg argues that this replacement "might

[57] Ælfric makes this point both in his first and second series of his *Catholic Homilies*: at the end of his Palm Sunday homily in the first series, he stresses: "Ciriclice þeawas forbeodað to secgenne ænig spell on ðam ðrim swigdagum," (The customs of the church forbid to preach any sermon on these three silent days), *CH* I, XIV, p. 298, note to line 220, and in his homily for the same occasion in the second series he, again, emphasises that "NE MOT NAN MAN SECGAN SPELL. ON ÞAM ÐRIM SWIGDAGUM," (no one may preach on these three silent days), *CH* II, XIV, p. 149, line 357. See also Joyce Hill, "Ælfric's 'Silent Days'," *LSE* n.s. 16 (1985), 118–31 and her "Two-Micro-Texts in Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*: A Puzzle Revisisted," in *Anglo-Saxon Micro-Texts*, ed. Ursula Lenker and Lucia Kornexl, Anglia Book Series 67 (Berlin, 2019), pp. 131– 42, as well as Kathryn A. Lowe, "Filling the Silence: Shared Content in Four Related Manuscripts of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*," *Digital Philology: A Journal of Medieval Cultures* 4 (2015), 200.

[58] Scragg, "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies," 238.

[59] Robert D. Fulk, "The Refashioning of Christ's Passion in an Anonymous Old English Homily for Palm Sunday (HomS 18)," *JEGP* 116 (2017), 435, demonstrates that the anonymous homily for Palm Sunday was probably considered to be better suited for this day as it was based on the expected gospel pericope, i.e.

suggest that these eight homilies were inserted *en bloc,* although linguistic and stylistic differences between them (and the fact that two of them have the same Latin source) argue against common authorship."[60] These eight consecutive, anonymous homilies are listed below.

Ker number	**Folios**	**Occasion**	**Conventional title or *DOE* short title**
309.19	108r–12r	Second Sunday in Lent	Vercelli III / Belfour V
309.20	112r–15v	Third Sunday in Lent	Assmann XI
309.21	115v–19r	Fourth Sunday in Lent	Belfour IV
309.22	119r–23r	Fifth Sunday in Lent	Assmann XII
309.23	123r–28r	Palm Sunday	HomS 18
309.24	128r–34v	Holy Thursday	Assmann XIII
309.25	134v–44r	Good Friday	Vercelli I
309.26	144r–52v	Holy Saturday	HomS 25

Table 3: Partial Table of Contents in Bodley 340

Scragg points out that Assmann XIII, Vercelli I, and HomS 25 "have significant links which have not hitherto been noted."[61] He lists the ending of Assmann XIII that promises to relate

Matthew's account of the Passion. Ælfric's homily for the same day, in contrast, featured Christ's entry to Jerusalem.

[60] Scragg, "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies," 238–39. A case in which homilies that are based on the same source do have common authorship can be found in Vercelli XIX–XXI, see Scragg, "An Old English Homilist of Archbishop Dunstan's Day."

[61] Scragg, "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies," 239.

the events of the passion on the next day and verbal echoes between the beginning of Assmann XIII and ending of HomS 25. These connections lead Scragg to suggest that "someone – perhaps the compiler of the set in E [i.e. Bodley 340] or perhaps an earlier redactor – took an old piece for Good Friday and developed it into a series for three successive days."[62] Although Bodley 340 was at Rochester at some point in the eleventh century, Scragg thinks it likely that the manuscript was compiled at Canterbury because so many southeastern manuscripts are based on it.[63] As a centre of learning with ties to Francia and eminent scriptoria, Canterbury could have acquired both manuscripts based on the *Catechesis Celtica* and the Pembroke homiliary.

CCCC 198 is so closely connected to Bodley 340 that Sisam called the first part of the manuscript a copy of Bodley 340.[64] CCCC 198 inserts Vercelli V at the beginning and adds the same group of anonymous homilies at the same point as Bodley 340:

Ker number	**Folios**	**Occasion**	**Conventional title or *DOE* short title**
48.19	132v–37r	Second Sunday in Lent	Vercelli III / Belfour V
48.20	137r–40v	Third Sunday in Lent	Assmann XI
48.21	140v–45r	Fourth Sunday in Lent	Belfour VI

[62] Ibid., 240. Moreover, Assmann XIII, and HomS 25 share Pembroke influenced phrases that might suggest common authorship for at least these two homilies. A more detailed linguistic analysis of the two texts is necessary to come to any definitive conclusion.

[63] Ibid., 240.

[64] Kenneth Sisam, *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (1953, repr. Oxford, 1967), p. 155.

48.22	145r–49v[65]	Fifth Sunday in Lent	Assmann XII
48.23	160r–66v	Palm Sunday	HomS 18
48.24	166v–74v	Holy Thursday	Assmann XIII
48.25	174v–86v	Good Friday	Vercelli I
48.26	186v–96v	Holy Saturday	HomS 25

Table 4: Partial Table of Contents in CCCC 198

CCCC 162 draws heavily on both Bodley 340 and CCCC 198 but differs in the homilies that it selects. As with the two previously discussed manuscripts, CCCC 162 inserts the silent day group into its mainly Ælfrician selection of homilies.

Ker number	**Pages**	**Occasion**	**Conventional title or *DOE* short title**
38.19	pp. 243–52[66]	Second Sunday in Lent	Vercelli III / Belfour V
38.20–27	pp. 252–322	*Eight Ælfrician homilies*	
38.28	pp. 322–33	Palm Sunday	HomS 18
38.29	pp. 333–47	Holy Thursday	Assmann XIII
38.30	pp. 347–65	Good Friday	Vercelli I
38.31	pp. 365–82	Holy Saturday	HomS 25
38.31–34	pp. 328–403	*Three Ælfrician homilies*	
38.35	pp. 403–12	Monday in Rogationtide	Vercelli XIX

[65] The Ælfrician homilies between Assmann XII and HomS 18 belong to the second part of the manuscript that was written slightly later than the first part, to which all the listed homilies belong. The intervening homilies are on a separate quire, suggesting that they were added later, see Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 82.

[66] Vercelli III, art. 19 in Ker, is inserted much earlier in the manuscript with eight Ælfrician homilies between it and HomS 18, art. 28 in Ker.

38.36	pp. 412–22	Tuesday in Rogationtide	Vercelli XX
38.37	pp. 422–31	Wednesday in Rogationtide	Bazire-Cross III
38.38	pp. 431–41	Ascension Day	Tristram III

Table 5: Partial Table of Contents in CCCC 162

In contrast to Bodley 340 and CCCC 198, CCCC 162 does not contain Assmann IX, Belfour VI, and Assmann XII but instead three anonymous Rogationtide homilies plus one for Ascension that are based on the Pembroke homiliary, i.e. Vercelli XIX, Vercelli XX, Bazire-Cross III, and Tristram III. Scragg has demonstrated the common authorship of Vercelli XIX, Vercelli XX, Vercelli XXI, and Tristram III on linguistic grounds.[67] Assmann XIII, however, contains none of the verbal parallels that Scragg identified in the homilies for Rogationtide and Ascension, suggesting that the Assmann XIII homilist drew independently from a text similar to *Sermo* 29.

The question remains, however, to which collection Assmann XIII is more likely to be connected—the Pembroke homiliary or the *Catechesis Celtica*. The manuscripts' provenance at least tends to favour the Pembroke homiliary. Whereas the *Catechesis Celtica* was transmitted in one manuscript that was written outside of England, probably in Brittany, the Pembroke homiliary, however, is extant in six manuscripts, five of which were written in England. Although all of them are dated later than the three earlier manuscripts containing Assmann XIII, their provenance at least makes it more likely that the Assmann XIII homilist had access to a manuscript similar to the Pembroke homiliary. Moreover, one late tenth-century fragment of the Pembroke homiliary, Canterbury, Cathedral Library and Archives,

[67] Scragg, "An Old English Homilist."

Add. 127/12, can be traced in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.[68] Of course, this kind of evidence needs to be treated with caution, as it is always possible that other witnesses have been lost. Nevertheless, the tenth-century English origin of some manuscripts containing the Pembroke homiliary can be interpreted as evidence in favour of the Pembroke homiliary.

The manuscript context of Assmann XIII provides more reliable evidence. Assmann XIII occurs together with homilies based on the *Catechesis Celtica* in at least two manuscripts: with Vercelli V and IX in Bodley 340, and with Vercelli V in CCCC 198. Vercelli XIX in CCCC 162 can point in either direction as it is based on the Pembroke homiliary, but draws its Seven Joys of Heaven motif from the *Catechesis Celtica*. The example of this homily in particular serves as a reminder of how difficult it is to establish the ultimate sources of Old English anonymous homilies.

The homilies that occur in close proximity to Assmann XIII in several manuscripts point in a different direction. In all three earlier manuscripts (CCCC 162, CCCC 198, and Bodley 340) Assmann XIII occurs alongside homilies that are clearly based on the Pembroke homiliary. In CCCC 198 and Bodley 340, Assmann XIII even occurs in close proximity to Assmann XI, Assmann XII, and Belfour VI. The presence of Assmann XIII among this cluster of Pembroke-based homilies indicates that, at least in these two manuscripts, Assmann XIII was probably transmitted together with three homilies that were based on the Pembroke homiliary. It is tempting to interpret this possible co-transmission as indicating a connection of Assmann XIII to the Pembroke homiliary. While the fact that Assmann XIII is transmitted together with Assmann XI, Assmann XII, and Belfour VI in two out of five manuscripts does not prove that the Assmann XIII homilist was drawing from the Pembroke homiliary directly, it does increase the likelihood that the homily is more closely related to a type of the Pembroke homiliary than to the *Catechesis Celtica*.

[68] Gneuss/Lapidge, no. 210.

Despite the evidence pointing towards the Pembroke homiliary as a more likely source of inspiration for the Assmann XIII homilist, it remains impossible to be certain if the Assmann XIII homilist had access to a version of the Pembroke homiliary or to the *Catechesis Celtica* or an individually transmitted homily similar to either or both of the relevant individual homilies. The situation of Assmann XIII can serve as an example for the difficulties of source hunting, which is likely ever to remain a discipline of unfinished business. What can be said, however, is that the Assmann XIII homilist was quite probably familiar with a text such as *Sermo* 29 that can be found in both the Pembroke homiliary and the *Catechesis Celtica*.[69]

[69] I wish to thank Thomas N. Hall, Susan Irvine and Winfried Rudolf for their comments on earlier drafts of this article and their helpful suggestions.

L1 The Sources and Composition of Two Old English Sunday Letter Homilies

Stephen Pelle

L2 Introduction

In this essay I discuss the relationship of two unexamined English copies of the Latin Sunday Letter to the Old English homiletic tradition, commenting also on what this relationship can tell us about the process of homiletic source study. The two Latin texts belong to a comparatively uncommon recension of the Sunday Letter, which, as Dorothy Haines has recently shown, lies behind two of the six surviving Old English homilies based on versions of the Letter.[1] As I shall demonstrate, these new Latin texts, the only known English representatives of the recension in question, often agree more exactly with the Old English homilies than the two Continental copies examined by Haines, and they are therefore probably closer to the homilies' putative source text(s). A comparison of the Latin and Old English texts thus allows us better to evaluate the originality of the homilies and their authors' methods of adapting their source. As part of this re-evaluation, I identify an apparently unnoticed example of alliterative verse embedded into the text of one of the Old English homilies.

Scholars of Anglo-Saxon religious prose have long known that the biblical apocrypha were important sources for many Old English preaching texts,[2] and one of the most influential apocrypha was the so-called Sunday Letter. This message, purportedly written by Christ himself or one of his angels, warns of various punishments for Christians who fail to observe

[1] Dorothy Haines, ed. and trans., *Sunday Observance and the Sunday Letter in Anglo-Saxon England*, Anglo-Saxon Texts 8 (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 51–52 and passim.

[2] See most recently Brandon Hawk, *Preaching Apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England*, TASS 30 (Toronto, 2018).

properly the Lord's Day (and, sometimes, promises benefits to those who keep Sunday correctly).[3] In most of its many versions, the Letter is said to have fallen from heaven onto the altar of a major church in one of Christendom's oldest and holiest centers, like Rome or Jerusalem, although some redactors transferred the Letter's descent to unexpected settings like Nîmes, perhaps in an effort to enhance the text's appeal to specific local audiences.[4] The document usually includes threats or curses directed against any priest or bishop who happens to come across it but does not preach it and send copies of it to his fellow clergymen. It is this characteristic of the text—its reliance on threats of divine punishment for its own transmission—that has led scholars including Jordan Zweck and Calogero Miceli to compare

[3] Secondary literature on the Sunday Letter is extensive. An important early study of the Western tradition including editions of some of the Latin texts is Hippolyte Delehaye, "Note sur la légende de la lettre du Christ tombée du ciel," *Bulletin de l'Académie royale belgique, Classe des lettres* 1 (1899), 171–213. For the Sunday Letter in England, see especially Haines, *Sunday Observance*; Clare A. Lees, "The 'Sunday Letter' and the 'Sunday Lists'," *Anglo-Saxon England* 14 (1985), 129–51; and Clare A. Lees, "Sunday Letter," in *SASLC: The Apocrypha*, ed. Frederick M. Biggs (Kalamazoo, 2007), pp. 58–61. Other useful studies can be found in Robert Faerber, "La *Lettre du Christ tombée du ciel* en anglais ancien," *Apocrypha* 12 (2001), 173–209; W. R. Jones, "The Heavenly Letter in Medieval England," *Medievalia et Humanistica* 6 (1975), 163–78; Karl Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten 23 (Berne, 1950), pp. 221–36; Robert Priebsch, "The Chief Sources of Some Anglo-Saxon Homilies," *Otia Merseiana* 1 (1899), 129–47; Robert Priebsch, *Letter from Heaven on the Observance of the Lord's Day* (Oxford, 1936); Jordan Zweck, "Letters from Heaven in the British Isles, 800–1500" (PhD diss., Yale University, 2010); and Zweck, *Epistolary Acts: Anglo-Saxon Letters and Early English Media*, TASS 29 (Toronto, 2018). A recent, more general study of letters from heaven and hell is Fanny Oudin, "Lettres de Dieu, lettres du Diable: Correspondances entre Terre, Ciel et Enfer," *Questes* 19 (2010), 37–55. Texts of the "Sunday List" genre, which were sometimes interpolated into versions of the Sunday Letter and sometimes circulated with them, will not be specifically discussed in this essay. See the articles by Lees cited above.

[4] See especially Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 46–47

the Sunday Letter to chain letters,[5] which nowadays largely take the form of emails or social media posts promising disaster to those who do not forward the message to a certain number of other people.

If we think of the Sunday Letter as perhaps the world's oldest chain letter (the first references to it occurring in Latin documents of the sixth century),[6] we must also, I think, concede that it is the most successful. The Letter's various redactions in Latin, Greek, and Syriac spawned countless descendants in nearly every major vernacular of Western and Eastern Christendom, from Icelandic and Irish to Georgian and Ethiopic.[7] The Letter's threats

[5] Zweck, "Letters from Heaven," pp. 19, 89; Zweck, *Epistolary Acts*, pp. 22, 64, 103–5; and Calogero A. Miceli, trans., "The Epistle of Christ from Heaven," in *New Testament Apocrypha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*, 1, ed. Tony Burke and Brent Landau (Grand Rapids, 2016), p. 457.

[6] See, inter alia, Zweck, *Epistolary Acts*, pp. 68–70; Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 37–38

[7] For a partial bibliography (which does not include the Western vernacular versions), see Maurice Geerard, *Clavis Apocryphorum Novi Testamenti*, CCC (Turnhout, 1992), pp. 190–93. Many of the Eastern texts were edited by Maximilian Bittner, "Der vom Himmel gefallene Brief in seinen morgenländischen Versionen und Rezensionen," *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 51.1 (1906), 1–240. On the Icelandic and Irish traditions, see, respectively, Katrina Attwood, "*Leiðarvísan* and the 'Sunday Letter' Tradition in Scandinavia," in *Til heiðurs og hugbótar: Greinar um trúarkveðskap fyrri alda*, ed. Svanhildur Óskarsdóttir and Anna Guðmundsdóttir, Rit 1 (Reykholt, 2003), pp. 53–78; and Vernam Hull, "Cáin Domnaig," *Ériu* 20 (1966), 151–77. Cf. also Martin McNamara, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church* (Dublin, 1975), pp. 60–64. There has been substantial debate over whether the original version of the Sunday Letter (if the enormous textual tradition can even be reduced to a single ancestor) was composed in Latin or Greek. Most of the early apocrypha, of course, moved from East to West, and many scholars assume the Sunday Letter took the same path (see, e.g., A. de Santos Otero, "Der apokryphe sogenannte Sonntagsbrief," *Studia patristica* 3 [1961], 290–96; and Miceli, "Epistle of Christ," pp. 456–57 with the references cited therein). Nevertheless, references to and copies of the Letter in the Latin West antedate the first Greek manuscripts of the text by some centuries, so the possibility of a Latin origin (as proposed by Priebsch, *Letter from Heaven*, pp. 33–34) cannot be lightly dismissed. See Lees, "Sunday Letter," p. 58.

were so effective in ensuring the text's survival that it continued to circulate among Christians of all denominations well into the modern era, in both the Old World and the New. Jordan Zweck's recent dissertation and monograph discuss appearances of the Letter in nineteenth-century Ukraine and Pennsylvania and in Berlin during World War II, and belief in the genuineness of the Letter and its apotropaic power persisted among some residents of Denmark, Iceland, and the Faroe Islands until at least the end of the twentieth century.[8] Zweck has fittingly called the Sunday Letter a "self-replicating document."[9] An alternative designation, less flattering but perhaps not wholly inaccurate, might be "textual virus"—the Sunday Letter exploits the authority of its supposed author (Christ himself or one of his angels) in order to multiply, and it is endlessly adaptable.[10]

In Anglo-Saxon England, the Sunday Letter seems to have circulated mainly as a preaching text, a homily. All surviving Old English versions of the Sunday Letter are homiletic in form and most survive in manuscripts largely or completely dedicated to homilies. The table below gives a summary of all known Old English Sunday Letter texts. Letter references are those used by Dorothy Haines. *DOE* short titles are also included, as are the item numbers of any items included in Arthur Napier's collection of Wulfstan and Pseudo-Wulfstan texts.[11] Dates are from Ker, *Catalogue*.

Haines	**Manuscript**	***DOE* short title**	**Napier**	**Latin source**

[8] Zweck, "Letters from Heaven," pp. 16–18, 134–37; Zweck, *Epistolary Acts*, pp. 72–73, 189; Jón Aðalsteinn Jónsson, "Himnabréf ömmu minnar Guðrúnar Ólafsdóttur frá Eystri-Lyngum í Meðallandi," *Ritmennt* 10 (2005), 18–48, esp. 35, 45–46.

[9] Zweck, *Epistolary Acts*, p. 63 and passim.

[10] The Letter's fantastic claim of divine authorship, shocking to modern sensibilities, clearly did not trouble many medieval copyists and readers; cf. Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. vii–viii.

[11] See Napier.

A	CCCC 140 (xi^{2})	HomU 54	–	Recension I
B	CCCC 419 (xi^{1})	HomU 36	XLV	Recension I
C	Lambeth 489 (xi$^{3/4}$)	HomU 46	LVII	Recension IIa
D	CCCC 162 (xi$^{in.}$)	HomU 53	–	Recension IIa
E	CCCC 419 (xi^{1})	HomU 35.1	XLIII	unknown (same as F)
F	Tiberius A. iii (xi$^{med.}$)	HomU 35.2	XLIV	unknown (same as E)
–	Otho B. x (burnt)	HomM 6	–	Recension I

Table 1: Old English Sunday Letter Homilies References and Their Latin Source Recensions

At least seven Old English Sunday Letter homilies survived the Middle Ages, although one (a text in London, BL, Cotton Otho B. x) was later destroyed in the Cotton Fire.[12] Dorothy Haines, whose monograph on the Sunday Letter is now the authoritative study of the genre in Anglo-Saxon England, assigns the letters *A* through *F* to the six extant Old English texts. Napier edited four of these six (*B*, *C*, *E*, and *F*) in his Wulfstan-collection and another (*D*) in a separate article.[13] *A* was edited by Robert Priebsch in 1899. All six surviving Old English homilies, *A* through *F*, have now been reedited by Haines. Napier and Priebsch were the first scholars to examine critically the relationship of the Old English Sunday Letter homilies to each other, to Sunday Letters surviving in other vernaculars, and to known Latin versions of the text. Priebsch's work was instrumental in separating the surviving Latin manuscripts of

[12] The incipit and explicit have been preserved in Humfrey Wanley, *Librorum veterum septentrionalium catalogus*, vol. 2. of *Linguarum veterum septentrionalium thesaurus*, ed. George Hickes (Oxford, 1705), p. 192, whence Ker, *Catalogue*, p. 229.

[13] Arthur Napier, "Contributions to Old English Literature," in *An English Miscellany Presented to Dr. Furnivall in Honour of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Oxford, 1901), pp. 355–62.

the text into three principal recensions;[14] for showing that two of the Old English Sunday Letters (*A* and *B*) derived from Recension I; and for demonstrating close parallels between homilies *E* and *F* and the Old Irish *Epistil Ísu*, though a direct Latin source for these texts has not yet been found and may not survive.[15]

The Latin Recension II and its derivatives will be discussed in some detail below, but first, a word on Recension III. This version of the Sunday Letter, specifically a variant type known as Recension IIIa that seems to have been composed around the year 1200 A.D., is best known for having been preached in England by the French abbot Eustace of Flay in 1201 A.D. in order to drum up support for the Fourth Crusade.[16] Haines lists several manuscripts of Recension IIIa,[17] but she omits an important early witness: Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 29, from the beginning of the thirteenth century. This manuscript is of particular interest because the same scribe who copied the Letter has, in the same quire, copied an early Middle English Christmas sermon, as well as several pieces in Latin that are known to have influenced Anglo-Saxon religious literature, such as the apocryphal text usually called "Adam

[14] As Zweck notes (*Epistolary Acts*, p. 71, n. 30), "Priebsch later divided the *Letter* into four redactions, but died before he could publish his full explanation." As a result, subsequent studies have largely employed the three-recension scheme.

[15] Priebsch, "Chief Sources" and *Letter from Heaven* (including introductory note on p. xxiii). On *E, F*, and the *Epistil Ísu* see also Dorothy Whitelock, "Bishop Ecgred, Pehtred and Niall," in *Ireland in Early Medieval Europe: Studies in Memory of Kathleen Hughes*, ed. Dorothy Whitelock, Rosamond McKitterick, and David Dumville (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 47–68; Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 82–86. For editions of the Latin texts most relevant to the Old English homilies, see Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 199–211.

[16] See Jones, "The Heavenly Letter" and Max Levy, *Der Sabbath in England: Wesen und Entwicklung des englischen Sonntags*, Kölner anglistische Arbeiten 18 (Leipzig, 1933), pp. 82–83. Eustace's text of Recension IIIa can be found in Roger of Hoveden's *Chronica*, ed. William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 4 vols. (London 1868–71), 4:167–69.

[17] Haines, *Sunday Observance*, p. 214.

Octipartite" and a homily on the wood of the cross which served as the basis for the Old English *History of the Holy Rood-Tree*.[18] The Sunday Letter therefore seems to have been considered an important preaching tool for English-speakers in the early thirteenth century, just as it had been in the pre-Conquest period. The continuing relevance of the Sunday Letter in the early Middle English period is further attested by the fourth of the early Middle English homilies in London, Lambeth Palace Library 487, from around the year 1200 A.D., which includes several sentences evidently taken from or inspired by some version of the Letter;[19] it features characteristic formulae from the Letter such as "the Lord himself says," as well as a familiar curse on those who do not keep the Lord's day holy:

> Nu bicumeð hit þerfore to uwilche cristene monne mucheles þe mare to haliȝen and to wurðien þenne dei þe is icleped sunnedei, for of þam deie ure lauerd seolf seið. *Dies dominicus est dies leticie & requiei.* Sunne dei is dei of blisse and of alle ireste. *Non facietur in ea aliquid nisi deum orare manudacre & bibere cum pace et leticia*. Ne beo in hire naþing iwrat bute chirche bisocnie and beode to criste and eoten and drinken mid griðe and mid gledscipe. *Sicut dicitur: pax in terra, pax in celo, pax inter homines*. For swa is iset: grið on eorðe and grið on hefene and grið bitwenen uwilc

[18] The Middle English sermon was edited by E. G. Stanley, "An Inedited Nativity Sermon from Worcester," *English and Germanic Studies* 7 (1961), 53–79. For a study of this text and a discussion of the manuscript's Latin contents, see Mark Faulkner and Stephen Pelle, "Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 29, fols. 133–7: An Early Middle English Sermon and Its Context," *Mediaeval Studies* 75 (2013), 147–76.

[19] On this homily see also Stephen Pelle, "Lambeth Homily 4 and the Textual Tradition of the *Visio Pauli*," forthcoming in *Old English Lexicology and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Antonette di Paolo Healey*.

cristene monne. Eft ure lauerd seolf seit: *Maledictus homo qui non custodit sabbatum.* Amansed beo þe mon þe sunnedei nulle iloken.[20]

Returning to the Old English texts: as I said above, Priebsch was able to identify sources or close analogues for most of the Old English Sunday Letter homilies. Two homilies, however, remained more enigmatic.[21] These were *C* and *D*, with which the present essay is primarily concerned. *C* survives in London, Lambeth Palace 489 from the third quarter of the eleventh century, while *D* is found in the early eleventh-century manuscript CCCC 162. A comparison of the two homilies reveals several shared details not found in other versions of the Sunday Letter, most notably the more important role given to the angelic amanuensis who is said to have written the letter on Christ's behalf and the specification that the "Bishop Peter" referred to in the text presided over the see of Antioch. The texts are not, however, verbally similar, and *C* has some notable digressions from the Sunday observance theme,

[20] Richard Morris, ed., *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises*, EETS o.s. 29, 34 (London, 1868), p. 45 (repunctuated). "It is fitting, therefore, that every Christian make holy and observe all the more the day that is called Sunday, because concerning this day our Lord himself says: *The Lord's day is the day of happiness and rest*. 'Sunday is the day of happiness and all rest.' *Nothing should be done on that day besides praying to God and eating and drinking in peace and happiness*. 'Let nothing be done on that day besides going to church and praying to Christ and eating and drinking with peace and with gladness.' *As it is said: peace on earth, peace in heaven, peace among men.* 'For thus it is said: peace on earth, and peace in heaven, and peace among all Christian men.' Again our Lord himself says: *Cursed be the man who does not keep the Sabbath.* 'Cursed be the man who will not observe Sunday.'" All translations are my own, with the exception of passages from the Vulgate, which are adapted from the Challoner revision of the Douay-Rheims translation. The apparent dependence of this section of Lambeth 4 on a version of the Sunday Letter was recognized by Joseph Hall, *Selections from Early Middle English, 1130–1250*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1920), 2:415.

[21] Priebsch, "Chief Sources," 146–47. Priebsch in fact spoke only of *C*, since Napier had not yet edited *D*. See Napier, "Contributions," pp. 356–57.

including interpolations from other anonymous homilies and from texts by Wulfstan.[22] Napier accordingly considered it likely that the two texts were independent renderings of an unknown Latin source, a hypothesis confirmed by Haines's discovery of that source—a distinctive variant of Recension II which she named Recension IIa.[23] This Latin redaction, as Haines showed, is also the source of a Middle English Sunday Letter sermon edited in 1994 by Veronica O'Mara from a fifteenth-century Durham manuscript,[24] as well as an analogue of Sunday Letter texts in Middle Welsh and Old French.[25]

Haines identified two manuscript copies of Recension IIa, both from the Continent and both rather late. The only complete text that was known to her survives in the fifteenth-century manuscript Vienna, Dominikanerkloster 133 (102) (henceforth **V**), and she also found a fragmentary copy in Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek – Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek, Fol. theol. 39 (**K**) of the fourteenth century.[26] In her 2010 monograph, Haines edited the **V** text and demonstrated convincingly that the recension it represents must have

[22] On these interpolations see Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, pp. 228–30 and Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 78–82 (as well as the latter's commentary on her edition of *C*).

[23] Napier, "Contributions," pp. 356–57; Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 51–52 and passim.

[24] V. M. O'Mara, ed., *A Study and Edition of Selected Middle English Sermons*, Leeds Texts and Monographs n.s. 13 (Leeds, 1994), pp. 81–136. O'Mara had already realized the close similarities between the Durham sermon and the Old English letters *C* and *D*, and she discusses them in some detail on pp. 102–107.

[25] Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 51–52. Some similarities between *C* and the Welsh and French versions were noted already by Priebsch, "Chief Sources," p. 146. For editions of the texts, see T. Powel, "Ebostol y sul," *Y Cymmrodor* 8 (1887), 162–72; J. Morris Jones and John Rhŷs, eds., *The Elucidarium and Other Tracts in Welsh*, Anecdota Oxoniensia: Mediaeval and Modern Series 6–7 (Oxford, 1894), pp. 157–59; and C. Brunel, "Versions espagnole, provençale et française de la Lettre du Christ tombée du ciel," *Analecta Bollandiana* 58 (1950), 394–95.

[26] Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 51–52, 213.

been the source of the Old English homilies *C* and *D*.[27] Homily *C*, as Napier hypothesized, represents a thorough reworking of the Latin source, while *D* usually translates it quite closely.[28] The Middle English Durham sermon plots a middle course, neither as extravagant in its digressions as *C* nor showing the same literal-mindedness as *D*.[29] It is thus clear that the three English preaching texts all represent independent translations of witnesses of Recension IIa of the Latin Sunday Letter.[30]

The discovery of Recension IIa by Haines provides a crucial point of access to two Old English Sunday Letter homilies as well as to a much later Middle English text. At the same time, however, some details of the Letter in Haines's manuscripts **V** and **K** of Recension IIa still differ from the Old English homilies. For homily *C*, whose author handled his source texts rather freely, such differences are not surprising and would not cry out for explanation. However, when the text of the more literal translation in homily *D* differs markedly from Haines's Latin, we are faced with a problem familiar to those who engage in source study of Old English texts: should we attribute these differences to the Anglo-Saxon author of the homily, or should we assume that his copy of the source text differed from our own? This problem and its implications have been described by Charles D. Wright with reference to another Old English homily, and his words on the matter are worth repeating here:

[27] See especially Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 185–88.

[28] Napier, "Contributions," p. 356; Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 78–82.

[29] See the discussion of the text's style in O'Mara, *Study and Edition*, pp. 104–107.

[30] O'Mara tentatively (and understandably, in light of the evidence then known) suggested that the Durham sermon might be based on an Old English text (*Study and Edition*, pp. 106–107); this possibility may now be rejected as unnecessary. There are no elements shared by the Durham text and the Old English homilies that cannot be explained by common reliance on the Latin source recension discovered by Haines.

> [W]e can rarely be certain that substantive differences we observe do not reflect variant readings in the homilist's lost manuscript. One may, nonetheless, attribute such differences to the homilist's invention or intervention as a working hypothesis, especially when the balance of the evidence suggests that he usually translates closely, and then draw tentative conclusions about a homilist's motives and concerns, especially when a consistent pattern emerges. Still, it is always possible that a variant text of the Latin source will come to light that is sufficient to account for some or all of the supposed alterations, and this will inevitably affect our assessment of the homilist's originality, his style, and potentially his purpose and his audience. In short, the discovery of a Latin source can be very revealing, but it can also be misleading—revealing when it affords concrete evidence for identifying a homilist's alterations to a source; misleading when that evidence turns out to be illusory because our text of the source differs substantially from the homilist's.[31]

As I hope to show, the Old English Sunday Letter homily *D* can serve as a kind of exemplary demonstration of the pitfalls and challenges posed by source study of closely-translated texts.

L2 Two English Manuscripts of the Latin Recension IIa

English libraries house at least two copies of Recension IIa of the Latin Sunday Letter that were not known to Haines, and the significance of these manuscripts for the Old English texts has not yet been assessed. A complete copy of the text (with two interpolations) survives in

[31] Charles D. Wright, "A Doomsday Passage in an Old English Sermon for Lent, Revisited," *Anglia* 128 (2010), 29. See also Wright, "Old English Homilies and Latin Sources," in *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. Aaron J. Kleist, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17 (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 20–23.

Oxford, Merton College 13 (henceforth **O**), the relevant portion of which was written around 1478 A.D. **O**, the contents of which have been described in detail by R. M. Thomson, also includes a number of other visionary and apocryphal texts, including the Infancy Gospels of Thomas and Pseudo-Matthew, the *Revelations* of Pseudo-Methodius, Redaction IV of the *Visio Pauli*, and the Gospel of Nicodemus.[32] The manuscript's copy of the *Visio* has been edited by Lenka Jiroušková, who also mentions some of the other texts in the manuscript, including the Sunday Letter.[33] Because **O**'s contents have been thoroughly catalogued, a detailed description of the manuscript here is unnecessary. The two interpolations into **O**'s text of the Sunday Letter, however, deserve some comment, even though they are not of immediate relevance to the Old English homilies.

Near the beginning of the **O** text, a reviser has added the following sentence immediately after the introductory account of the delivery of the Sunday Letter to Peter of Antioch: "Talis etiam uel consimilis epistola fertur data in Golgatha, que descendit celitus in altari Sancti Symeonis presbiteri, cuius manibus Christus <circumcisus> est."[34] This addition shows that the reviser compared his exemplar to (or at least knew of the existence of) another version of the Sunday Letter, namely Redaction IIIa (the text-type used by Eustace of Flay),

---

[32] R. M. Thomson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of Merton College, Oxford* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 13–18.

[33] Lenka Jiroušková, *Die Visio Pauli: Wege und Wandlungen einer orientalischen Apokryphe im lateinischen Mittelalter unter Einschluss der alttschechischen und deutschsprachigen Textzeugen* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 106–8. See also Zbigniew Izydorczyk, *Manuscripts of the Evangelium Nicodemi: A Census*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Subsidia medievalia 21 (Toronto, 1993), pp. 126–27.

[34] **O** fol. 64vb: "Such a letter, or a very similar one, is also said to have been conveyed to Golgotha; it descended from heaven onto the altar of Saint Simeon the priest, by (or 'in'?) whose hands Christ was circumcised." The word *circumcisus* is not present in the manuscript but seems necessary for the sense of the passage; see Luke 2:25–35.

which begins "Mandatum sanctum Dominicae diei, quod de coelo venit in Jerusalem, et inventum est super altare Sancti Symeonis, quod est in Golgatha, ubi Christus crucifixus est pro peccatis mundi."[35] The second interpolation in **O**, which comes at the very end of the text, is longer and harder to interpret. While **V**'s text concludes with a short valediction to "my brother" ("frater mi"),[36] **O** ends as follows:

> Valeatis coepiscopi mei, hec dicentes et per populum diuulgantes, et a uobismetipsis incipientes, et perficientes hec omnia predicta, ne uobis in die iudicii prestricti dicatur a domino: "Discedite a me; nescio uos, qui noluistis uel pondere unius digiti adimplere per onera que imposuistis gregi domini."
>
> Dominus enim cunctis sancte ecclesie fidelibus, tam prelatis quam subditis, cum cunctis maneat sors irreuocabilis hore, nobis suam largam donet benedictionem.
>
> Notum uobis facio, sicut cum deo esse cupimus, de quodam fratre nostro dilectissimo .*N.*, quem dominus de ergastulo huius seculi uocauit, pro quo obsecramus obnixe

[35] Roger of Hoveden, *Chronica*, 4:167: "The holy commandment regarding the Lord's Day, which came to Jerusalem from heaven and was found upon the altar of Saint Simeon, which is in Golgotha, where Christ was crucified for the sins of the world." It should be noted that the idea that the Sunday Letter was found on the altar of Saint Simeon in Golgotha antedates Eustace of Flay's preaching campaign of 1201. An Old Norse pilgrim's guide called *Leiðarvísir*, written in the 1150s by the Icelandic Benedictine abbot Nikulás Bergsson, also says that the Letter came down onto Saint Simeon's altar (Attwood, "*Leiðarvísan*," pp. 65–66). Therefore, although the earliest known manuscripts of Recension IIIa are associated with Eustace's mission, this version of the Sunday Letter (or at least elements that came to be incorporated into it) must have already been circulating at least a half-century earlier.

[36] Haines, *Sunday Observance*, p. 211, line 100.

> strenui interuentores ad dominum, ut misereatur omnium populorum suorum semper. Amen. Explicit epistola domini dei nostri tradita Petro Antiochensi episcopo…[37]

The first sentences of this extended conclusion make yet another threat against priests and bishops who do not circulate the Letter; this section of **O**'s conclusion is partly paralleled in **L** (see below) and may in fact be an original component of Recension IIa, the shorter ending of **V** being a later abbreviation.[38] The last few sentences quoted above (from "Dominus" to "semper") are adapted from a letter-formula that solicits prayers for a recently dead monk from the residents of neighbouring monasteries, the ultimate source of which appears to be the *Regularis concordia* (though the same formula also appears in Ælfric's *Letter to the Monks of*

[37] fol. 65vb: "Farewell, my fellow bishops, and be sure to announce these things and disseminate them among the people, starting with yourselves (?) and bringing all of the things said above to completion, lest the Lord should say to you on the day of the severe Judgement: 'Depart from me; I do not know you, who would not even lift a finger to help bear the burdens you placed on the flock of the Lord.' [The previous clause seems corrupt; I have guessed at the sense.] Since the fate of the inevitable hour awaits all of us, may the Lord bestow upon us all, the faithful of the holy Church, both prelates and subordinates, his gracious blessing. We are notifying you, just as we desire to be with God [the meaning of this clause in this context is unclear], about our most beloved brother .*N.*, whom the Lord called forth from the prison of this world, on whose behalf we plead strenuously as vigorous intercessors to the Lord, that he may always have mercy on all of his people. Amen. Here ends the letter of the Lord our God given to Peter the bishop of Antioch…." Several parts of this conclusion are probably corrupt.

[38] The Old English homilies *C* and *D* provide no help in determining the original form (or even presence) of the epistolary conclusion in Recension IIa. *C* abandons the Sunday observance theme entirely and concludes instead with a number of other homiletic motifs, while *D* ends rather abruptly with a variation of a traditional homiletic doxology. See Haines, *Sunday Observance*, p. 144.

Eynsham).[39] Its intended purpose in the **O** text of the Sunday Letter is difficult to guess. Perhaps by appending some more mundane correspondence the reviser sought to make the rest of the Letter seem more genuine or believable.

An abbreviated copy of Recension IIa also survives in an earlier English manuscript, London, BL, Cotton Vitellius D. xi (henceforth **L**), the relevant portion of which (fols. 1r–34v) was probably written in the mid-thirteenth century.[40] This part of the manuscript suffered moderate damage during the Cotton Fire, and some text at the edges of many leaves has been destroyed or rendered illegible (at least on microfilm). **L** was catalogued by Thomas Smith in the late seventeenth century, and all subsequent descriptions of the manuscript depend on his work.[41] The text on fols. 8v–34v, identified by Smith as a "Historia Angliæ, à Bruto ad R. Henricum II," seems to have attracted no further attention.[42] The various short works on fols. 1r–8v received only cursory descriptions:

1. Liber Methodii Episcopi de principio et fine seculi. F. 1.

[39] See Christopher A. Jones, *Ælfric's Letter to the Monks of Eynsham*, CSASE 24 (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 143–44 and 215.

[40] The online BL catalogue manuscript catalogue (http://searcharchives.bl.uk [accessed 2019 November 12]) gives the date "1st half of the 15th century," but this is clearly an error; the script is of a much earlier type. My thanks to Prof. Alexander Andrée for reassessing the date for me.

[41] Thomas Smith, *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Cottonianae*, annotations by Humfrey Wanley, ed. C. G. C. Tite (Cambridge, 1984), not paginated.

[42] Smith, *Catalogus*. Inc.: "Eo tempore quo Hely sacerdos imperabat in Iudea, archaque domini capta fuit a Philitsteis …." This text (and perhaps **L** itself) appears to be the source of some brief excerpts copied in the late sixteenth century into CCCC 298 (digitized at http://parker.stanford.edu [accessed 2019 November 1]; see M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, 2 vols. [Cambridge, 1912], 2:86).

> 2. Quædam fabulosæ narrationes de visionibus & apparitionibus, aliisque. Inter hæc occurrit epistola Jesu Christi de interdictione omnium malorum, & de observantia omnium bonorum, quam Angelus suo digito scripsit. F. 4.[43]

The Sunday Letter must have seemed noteworthy to Smith, since he provided more information about it (giving an extensive incipit) than he did for the other texts. It is worthwhile here to describe more thoroughly the rest of the contents of this part of **L** as it has survived to us, so that we may get a better idea of the kind of texts with which Recension IIa of the Letter circulated.

> 1. (fols. 1r–2v): Pseudo-Methodius, *Revelations* – beginning of text lost; expl.: "… et impii sine fine pe<nam patien>tur, unde nos deus eripere dignetur qui uiuit …." This text belongs to Recension II of the *Revelations* and is similar to that edited from three English manuscripts by Charlotte D'Evelyn, "The Middle English Metrical Version of the *Revelations* of Methodius, with a Study of the Influence of Methodius in Middle English Writings," *PMLA* 33 (1918), 192–203.[44]

---

[43] Smith, *Catalogus*. "1. The book of the bishop Methodius on the beginning and end of the world. 2. Some fabulous accounts of visions, apparitions, and other matters. Among these is found a letter of Jesus Christ regarding the prohibition of all evils and the observance of all good things, which an angel wrote with his own finger."

[44] For another Recension II text, see Otto Prinz, "Eine frühe abendländische Aktualisierung der lateinischen Übersetzung des Pseudo-Methodios," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 41 (1985), 1–23. Brief notes on the textual history and influence of the *Revelations* in England can be found in Michael Twomey, "Pseudo-Methodius Revelations," in *SASLC: The Apocrypha*, ed. Frederick M. Biggs (Kalamazoo, 2007), pp. 18–20.

2. (fols. 2v–5v): excerpts from Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 5.12 and 5.13 (Colgrave and Mynors, pp. 488–502) – inc.: "Refert sanctus Beda miraculum memorabile …"; expl.: "… cui non profuere, sed pro aliis uiderit." The visions of Dryhthelm (5.12) and the thane of Cenred (5.13).[45]

3. (fols. 5v–6v): Sunday Letter – inc.: "<Incipit> epistola domini nostri Iesu Christi saluatoris mundi de interdictione omnium malorum et de <obs>eruantia omnium bonorum quam angelus domini suo digito scripsit …"; expl.: … a uobismetipsis incipientes et perficientes hec omnia predicta." An abbreviated text of Recension IIa of the Latin Sunday Letter. Note that the conclusion agrees in part with the extended conclusion found in **O** (described above).

4. (fols. 6v–7v): Vision of a Monk of Rome – inc.: "Legimus in historiis sanctorum patrum, f.k., quod sanctus Bonefacius …"; expl.: "… quatinus erepte de igne tribulacionis et imperio mendicitatis feliciter transire ualeant ad gaudia eterne felicitatis, quod ipse …." An unedited sermon recounting a vision of purgatory said to have been experienced by a Roman monk at the time of Pope Boniface IV (r. 608–15 A.D.). The opening is adapted from a popular All Saints' Day sermon generally called "Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis" (after its incipit).[46] The text itself, which, among other things, describes the great benefit that the souls in Purgatory gain from the prayers of the living, was also apparently intended as a sermon, either for All Saints'

[45] Bede's account of Dryhthelm circulated as an independent text not only in Latin (see, e.g., p. 138 of DiTommaso's article cited in n. 49 below) but also in Old English, forming the basis of one of Ælfric's Second Series homilies (*CH* II, XXI, pp. 199–203); see also Sharon Rowley, *The Old English Version of Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 16 (Cambridge, 2011), p. 185.

[46] The standard edition and most thorough study is James E. Cross, "'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis': A Sermon for All Saints and its Use in Old English Prose," *Traditio* 33 (1977), 101–35.

Day (1 November) or All Souls' Day (2 November). The earliest known copy of the sermon is found in an Italian manuscript, Fermo, Biblioteca civica 33 (s. xii).[47] Besides **L**, at least four other English witnesses survive: Cambridge, Pembroke College 85 (s. xiii), fol. 106r; Cambridge, Pembroke College 258 (s. xiii) fols. 53va–54ra; Cambridge, St John's College 83 (s. xv), beginning on fol. 166r; and London, BL, Add. 18335 (s. xiii), beginning on fol. 25r.[48] The sermon is an interesting document for the study of both medieval vision literature and the development of the concept of purgatory, and it deserves further study.

[47] See especially Serafino Prete, "'Ordinatio palatii regis Gundafohri' dal manoscritto 33 della Biblioteca Civica di Fermo," in *Miscellanea Giulio Belvederi*, Collezione Amici delle 319arrativ 23 (Vatican City, 1954), pp. 507–8; Prete, *I codici della Biblioteca Comunale di Fermo: Catalogo*, Biblioteca di bibliografia italiana 35 (Florence, 1960), pp. 38–39; Mario Santoro, "Notizia su alcuni codici dei secoli X, XII, XIII conservati nella Biblioteca comunale di Fermo," in *Le marche nei secoli XII e XIII: Problemi e ricerche – Atti del VI Convegno del Centro di Studi Storici Maceratesi*, Studi Maceratesi 6 (Macerata, 1972), pp. 47–48. The date of the Fermo manuscript renders virtually impossible an old attribution of the text to Praepositinus (Prévostin) of Cremona (d. 1210) found, for instance, in Johannes Baptista Schneyer, *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150–1350*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters: Texte und Untersuchungen 43, 11 vols. (Münster, 1973–90), 4:875. On Praepositinus see Peter Harris Tibber, "The Origins of the Scholastic Sermon, *c.*1130–*c.*1210" (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1983), pp. 61–64.

[48] On the Cambridge manuscripts see Lorenzo DiTommaso, "Pseudepigrapha Notes II: 3. The Contribution of the Manuscript Catalogues of M.R. James," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (2008), 109, 132 (and the works of James cited therein). On the London manuscript see Schneyer, *Repertorium*, 4:875–6, and Georges Lacombe, *La vie et les œuvres de Prévostin*, Prepositini Cancellarii Parisiensis (1206–1210) Opera omnia 1, Bibliothèque thomiste 11. (Tournai, 1927), pp. 73, 184, 187. A thirteenth-century Italian manuscript (Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 1058) that contains the sermon has been digitized and can be viewed online at https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.1058 (accessed 2019 November 12); see fols. 128r–29v.

5. (fols. 7v–8v): unidentified text – inc.: "<C>um (or <Quonia>m?) debet unusquisque proximo suo sicut sibi iuuare et prouidere et sapere, studuimus quorundam pia opera et iusticias, quorundam iniquitates et necligencias in hac uita et in sequenti utrorumque siue premia siue supplicia stilo commendare …. Erat quidam conuersus ordinis Cisterciensis …"; expl.: "… quia momentaneam peccati uoluptatem nunc producta, nunc productior, nunc perhennis pena subsequitur." The story of a murdered Cistercian *conversus* whose spirit appears to his confrères, reveals that he is being tormented greatly (mainly for not having taken his duty to pray for the dead seriously enough), and asks for their prayers. I have not been able to find this exact text elsewhere, but similar stories appear in other collections of exempla associated with the Cistercians.[49] In its focus on prayer for the dead the story is thematically similar to the previous text.

The Sunday Letter in **L**, therefore, was part of a collection of apocryphal stories and otherworld visions,[50] some quite old (Pseudo-Methodius, the Bede excerpts), others much younger (the visions of the Roman monk and the apparition of the murdered Cistercian).

[49] See, e.g., Olivier Legendre, ed., *Collectaneum exemplorum et visionum Clarevallense e codice Trecensi 946*, CCCM 206 (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 249, 259, 364–65; J. A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. 3 (London, 1910), p. 466. I found these exempla by searching the *Thesaurus exemplorum Medii Aevi*, available at http://thema.huma-num.fr/index.php. Accessed 2019 July 10. For more on this theme and references to similar exempla, see Joan Mahiques Climent, "El ciclo narrative del cura difunto y la misa no celebrada en vida: un precedente historiográfico del siglo XVII," *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares* 69 (2014), 192.

[50] The two genres merge in a way in the Old English Sunday Letters *E* and *F*, in which the otherworldly experiences of an Irish deacon named Niall are used to corroborate Christ's threats. See Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 84–85.

Similar material is, as I have noted above, also present in **O**, though here it is scattered throughout the volume rather than incorporated into a single unit.

L2 The Importance of **L** and **O** to the Study of the Old English Texts

The newly-identified Latin manuscripts are important witnesses to the circulation of Recension IIa in two respects relevant to the Old English homilies: first, both were written in England rather than on the Continent; and second, manuscript **L** is closer in time to the Old English texts by about a century than **K**, the older of the two copies previously known. Given this increased geographical and temporal proximity, we might expect these two Latin manuscripts to be textually closer to the source of the Old English Sunday Letter homilies *C* and *D* than **V** or **K**. This is, in fact, exactly what we find. In the appendix to this chapter, I have identified 30 places where the Old English homily *D* apparently depended on Latin readings closer to those of manuscripts **L** and/or **O** than to those of **V** or **K**. While such instances are more difficult to identify in *C* because of its author's freer adaptation of his source, one can find many examples supporting the same conclusions in this text as well. Since **L** and **O** are later than the Old English Sunday Letters, my argument here rests on the assumption that the agreements between them and Old English homilies *C* and *D* resulted from the influence of Latin texts on Old English homilies and not vice-versa—that is, that copies of the Latin Recension IIa in England did not begin to incorporate readings that originated in English vernacular Sunday Letter texts. I consider this latter possibility unlikely. Even though the known Latin manuscripts of Recension IIa all postdate *C* and *D*, the general dependence of the Old English homilies on Latin texts of Recension IIa similar to the extant copies is proved by instances where an odd reading in the Old English can be explained as the result of a scribal error in the Latin source (as is the case with *D*'s *gewyrhtan*, discussed below).

Examining the text of the Old English Sunday Letter homilies *C* and *D* in light of the two new Latin manuscripts of Recension IIa significantly alters our assessment of several aspects of the Anglo-Saxon authors' work, including their originality, their skill as translators, and their prose style. In what follows, I shall briefly discuss one example relevant to each of these three concerns.

One of the few original contributions for which Haines credits the author of homily *D* is his specific address to the rich when introducing a quotation from Isaiah 5:20 (see Appendix number 4): "Gemunað *ge weligan* þæt ge eowre wiste rihtlice gehealden, and ondrædað eow þæt þæt awriten is þurh þone witegan: Wa eow þe wyrcað dæg to nihte and niht to dæge … ."[51] A similar address is found in homily *C*, though Haines does not comment on it: "And, *ge rican men*, geþencað, þæt þeos woruld is neah þam ende, geswicað eowra unþeawa and ne awende ge ne þone dæg to nihte ne þa niht to dæge."[52] Haines's judgement that the address to the rich was an embellishment added to the Old English text(s) would have seemed sensible to anyone examining the evidence available at the time, since no such address is present either in manuscript **V** of the Latin Recension IIa or in the Middle English Durham sermon. However, if we look at manuscript **O** (the only other Recension IIa text that preserves this section) we find a clear address to wealthy listeners: "Nolite ergo, *diuites*, diem facere de nocte et noctem de die."[53] The rest of the sentence in *D*, which admonishes the wealthy not to feast too much, though not paralleled directly in either **V** or **O**, may have suggested itself to the author because of his source's apparent address to the wealthy, but it is

[51] Haines, *Sunday Observance*, p. 140, lines 102–104. "Remember, *rich people*, to engage in feasting with moderation, and fear what was written through the prophet: 'Woe to you who make day into night and night into day.'" See also p. 78.

[52] Haines, *Sunday Observance*, p. 140, lines 132–33. "And *you, rich people*, consider that this world is approaching its end and turn away from your vices, and do not change the day to night or the night to day."

[53] "Do not then, *rich people*, make day out of night or night out of day."

also possible that a parallel even for this might be found in some unknown Recension IIa manuscript. One of the supposedly original contributions of the Anglo-Saxon authors of homilies *C* and *D* is therefore shown to be, in all likelihood, derived from their Latin source, and any aid that this address to the rich might have provided in determining the audience of the Old English homilies is therefore cut off or at least diminished. Nevertheless, while some interpretative doors close, others open, since it is now possible to ask why the scribe of the Latin manuscript **V** (or his exemplar) *omitted* the word *divites*—was it a simple error, or perhaps a choice caused by a desire not to offend wealthy members of his anticipated audience?[54]

An Anglo-Saxon homilist's departures from his apparent source can also affect our view of his skill or habits as a translator—that is to say, of his grasp of Latin and his general intellectual ability. Number 14 in the Appendix is not at all a severe case, but it can nevertheless serve as an illustrative example. Here, homily *D* reads "And swa hwa swa ænig woruldlic weorc on sunnandæg wyrcð … ic hine fornime and his *gewyrhtan* and his gefylstan of minum rice."[55] This time, both **V** and **O** read "eius fautores"[56] where *D* has "gewyrhtan."

[54] Such a question assumes that *divites* was present in the archetype of Recension Iia and not simply added at some point in the textual tradition of the Latin copies used by the authors of the Old English texts. Moreover, as discussed above, my whole line of inquiry assumes that elements like the address to the rich entered the Old English texts from the Latin letter and not the other way around, but the idea of vernacular influence on the Latin texts hardly seems plausible in this case. Both *C* and *D* contain reflexes of *divites* in analogous places, which is easiest to explain as a result of the use of related texts of a common Latin source in which the word was already present.

[55] Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 134–36, lines 59–62. "And whoever performs any secular work on Sunday … I will remove him and his *workers* and those who help him from my kingdom."

[56] "His supporters." Note that *D*'s "and his gefylstan" (and those who help him) translates literally a separate Latin phrase, "suosque adiutores"; it is not simply a variation of "gewyrhtan."

The reading in Old English homily *C*, "ealle þa þe him to þam unrihte fylstað,"[57] corresponds well to "fautores." Old English *gewyrhta* can mean something like "accomplice" but the word's most transparent sense is simply "doer" or "(fellow-)worker," and so initially it does not seem like the clearest possible rendering of a Latin word meaning "supporter."[58] However, the Latin manuscript **L** gives a clue as to what might have happened here, because in place of "fautores" it reads "factores" (doers, workers). From a text-critical point of view, "fautores" is clearly the preferable reading, since it is much more likely to have been corrupted by a scribe into "factores" than for "factores" to have been replaced by the rarer "fautores." However, because of the reading "factores" in **L**, I believe we are obliged to assume that the *fautor/factor* mix-up, which probably led to *D*'s suspicious reading "gewyrhtan," had already occurred in the *D* author's source and was not committed by the author himself.[59] Cases like this demand that we question some assumptions that we are tempted to make when dealing with what seem to be mistranslations in Old English texts. It is typical in such cases to presume that the problem lies with the Anglo-Saxon author rather than his Latin source, but the more one examines the surviving manuscript copies of some of these sources, the more one appreciates that they are often highly corrupt themselves.[60] In other

[57] Haines, *Sunday Observance*, p. 134, line. 100. "All who help him obtain what is wrong."

[58] Bosworth-Toller, s.v. *gewyrhta*.

[59] §§ 7 and 8 of the Irish *Cáin Domnaig*, probably composed in the eighth century, give some idea of what actions or inactions might have been seen as 'supporting' the profanation of Sunday; see Hull, "Cáin Domnaig," pp. 166–69.

[60] For some examples relevant to the recently discovered Old English Taunton Fragment, see Aidan Conti, "The Taunton Fragment and the Homiliary of Angers: Context for New Old English," *RES* n.s. 60 (2008), 15–16, 28–30.

words, it is not necessarily that the authors of the Old English anonymous homilies were poor Latinists; it is that the Latin they were trying to read was poor (or at least highly irregular).[61]

Finally, our critical assessment of an Anglo-Saxon author's style depends on our having an accurate idea of the nature of his source manuscripts, and here I speak with reference to number 27 in the Appendix. One of the most common stylistic traits not only in the anonymous homilies but also in Germanic religious literature in general, especially Old English and Old Norse, is the use of two synonyms or near-synonyms where a Latin source text has only a single term.[62] In Wulfstan's prose these binomials often alliterate or rhyme, but this is not always the case, especially in the anonymous homilies.[63] Even when such doubling was not an original feature of an Old English text, it might creep in through the addition of interlinear glosses that became incorporated into later copies, or indeed through the

[61] For example, in two Latin collections with links to Old English anonymous homilies – the so-called *Apocrypha priscillianistica* and *Catechesis cracoviensis* – the case forms and orthography are so chaotic that it is frequently difficult to determine what the authors were trying to say. The texts can be found in Donatien de Bruyne, "Fragments retrouvés d'apocryphes priscillianistes," *RE* 24 (1907), 318–35; and Brygida Kürbis, Jerzy Wolny, and Danuta Zydorek, eds. *Praedicationes per diversa ieiunia et varia e codice Cracoviensi 140 (43)/Kazania na różne dni postne I inne teksty z kodeksu krakowskiego 140 (43)*, Monumenta Sacra Polonorum 4 (Krakow, 2010).

[62] See, e.g., Nicole Guenther Discenza, *The King's English: Strategies of Translation in the Old English Boethius* (Albany, 2005), pp. 58–63; see now also the essays in Joanna Kopaczyk and Hans Sauer, eds., *Binomials in the History of English: Fixed and Flexible,* Studies in English Language (Cambridge, 2017). For Old Norse examples see, e.g., Reidar Astås, *An Old Norse Biblical Compilation: Studies in Stjórn*, American University Studies 108 (New York, 1991), pp. 111–12.

[63] Hiroshi Ogawa, *Language and Style in Old English Composite Homilies* (Tempe, 2010), pp. 12–18, 39–40, and passim.

intentional interventions of scribes.[64] It would not at all be surprising, therefore, for the single Latin word *gula* 'gluttony' to give rise to the Old English word-pair *gyfernys and oferdruncennys* 'gluttony and drunkenness,' as it would appear to have done in homily *D* based on a comparison of the Old English text to the Latin from Haines's manuscript **V**. However, in manuscript **O** of Recension IIa we in fact find not only *gula* (as in **V**), but *gula et ebrietas*, corresponding exactly to what the Old English text has, and thus removing any reason for attributing the binomial in the homily to anything but literal translation.

L2 Finding Room for the Translator's Contribution

It is understandable that scholars, including those interested in the Old English anonymous homilies, would want to claim some originality for the authors of the texts that they study, even when such texts are demonstrably based on surviving Latin sources. Such attempts to find a place for the Anglo-Saxon translator's voice and method within the constraints imposed on him by his sources are fine, and indeed necessary for our study of these texts. However, as the examples above show, we must always be aware of the possibility that even the most minute and seemingly inconsequential details we try to attribute to the originality of the Anglo-Saxon anonymous homilists may, as in the case of Sunday Letter homily *D*, derive ultimately from their sources and not from themselves. Even their apparent mistakes are not necessarily their own, as the *fautor/factor* problem shows.

As exciting as it is to find a source (or a closer source) for an Old English homily, then, such a discovery always holds the possibility of disappointment, since it might force us to acknowledge that some of what we thought was original to the text has in fact been said

[64] See, for instance, Godden's discussion and transcription of the copy of Ælfric's Second Series Palm Sunday homily in Cotton Tiberius A. iii (*CH* II, pp. lv–lvi and the appendix, pp. 381–90, e.g., lines 20, 31, 47, 84–85, 113, 150, 195, 258, and 322).

before. I have sometimes thought that if source scholars were to adopt a motto, it should be "There is no new thing under the sun" (Eccles. 1:9 in the King James Version). But then, creating new content or doctrine was not the intention of the medieval homilist, who was instead concerned with presenting in understandable and relevant ways doctrines that were considered timeless. The real contributions made by the authors of the Old English anonymous homilies to their texts lie more often in their style and structure than in their substance. In what follows, I discuss one apparent example of such a contribution.

As I mentioned above, the Old English Sunday Letter homily *C* contains passages borrowed from other works, including texts by Wulfstan. Dorothy Haines has argued that Wulfstan's stylistic influence can be detected in the homily even outside the borrowed passages, and she points to one section in particular as an example,[65] where Christ makes the following threat (emphases Haines's):

> [I]c sende ofer eow min yrre on feower wisan, þæt is, hunger and sweordes ecge, cwyld and hæftnunge. Þæt is, þa þe ahte syndon, hi sculon *fleonde* on *gefeohte* beon ofslagene, and þa *ealdan* sculan *earmlice* licgan *heapmælum* æt *ham hungre* acwolene. And man sceal þa *geoguðe geomorlice* lædan *gehæft* syððan on *hæðenra hand heries* lafe. And syððan æfter þære *earmlycan eowre geendunge*, ic besence eowre *sawla* on *susle* on helle, swa swa ic hwilon dyde þa twa burh Sodoman and Gomorram, þe mid heofonlican *fyre* her wurdon *forbærnde*, and ealle þa, þe him on eardodon, æfre byrnað on *hellegrunde* on *hatan* fyre, forþan hi þone *mildan* God *manfullice* gremedon.[66]

[65] Haines, *Sunday Observance*, pp. 80–81, esp. n. 92.

[66] Haines, *Sunday Observance*, p. 132, line 77 – p. 134, line 88. "I shall send my anger over you in four ways, that is hunger and sword's edge, pestilence and captivity. That is to say, those who are worth anything will be

This fiery passage is certainly reminiscent of Wulfstan in terms of content, but I think its form might be re-evaluated. Wulfstan and his imitators (if it is correct to use that term)[67] often use alliterative word-pairs, of course, but many of the runs of alliteration here consist of more than two alliterating items. In fact, much if not most of this section lends itself not to the two-stress alliterative framework of Wulfstanian prose but to the four-position structure of Old English alliterative verse, and it works well if read aloud with that in mind:

> ... and þa ealdan sculan earmlice licgan
> heapmælum æt ham hungre acwolene.
> And man sceal þa geoguðe geomorlice lædan
> gehæft heanlice mid heardum bendum
> and swa bysmorlice bringan of heora eðle
> and betæcan eow teonlice syððan
> on hæðenra hand, heries lafe.

---

slain while fleeing in battle, and the old will in great numbers lie wretchedly dead at home, killed by hunger. And the young, shamefully restrained with hard bonds, will be miserably taken captive afterwards and in this manner they will brought forth from their homeland in disgrace. And afterwards you will be given over into the hands of heathens as the spoils of the army. And after your wretched death I shall plunge your souls into torment in hell, as I once did to the two cities Sodom and Gomorrah, which were burnt up here with celestial fire, and all of those who dwelt in them burn forever in the depths of hell in hot fire because they wickedly enraged the merciful God."

[67] See Hiroshi Ogawa, "A 'Wulfstan Imitator' at Work: Linguistic Features of Napier XXX," in Ogawa, *Studies in the History of English Prose* (Tokyo, 2000), pp. 278–79.

Most of the resultant half-lines here can be fitted into or at least resemble typical Old English poetic rhythms, especially if allowances are made for the loosening of older metrical rules typical of later Anglo-Saxon verse.[68]

It is interesting to note that the known Latin manuscripts of Redaction IIa have nothing that corresponds to the most clearly metrical part of this section, which I have laid out as verse above (see number 8 in the Appendix). This invites some speculation as to where exactly these lines came from. Since we know that the author (or at least the scribe) of the Old English Sunday Letter *C* borrowed pieces of his homily from other texts, might he also have taken these lines from somewhere, perhaps from some poem on the ravages of war that does not otherwise survive? If so, the incorporation of verses into the homily would not be unlike the inclusion in Vercelli XXI of excerpts from *An Exhortation to Christian Living* as well as other, now lost, vernacular poems.[69] However, although the use of pre-existing poems as sources seems to have been a common practice for Anglo-Saxon preachers,[70] I have argued

---

[68] See, e.g., R. D. Fulk, *A History of Old English Meter*, Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia, 1992), pp. 251–68.

[69] *VH*, pp. 347–50; Charles D. Wright, "More Old English Poetry in Vercelli Homily XXI," in *Early Medieval Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser (Tempe, 2002), pp. 245–62.

[70] See, e.g., Eric Stanley, "*The Judgement of the Damned*, from Corpus Christi College Cambridge 201 and Other Manuscripts, and the Definition of Old English Verse," in *A Collection of Papers with Emphasis on Old English Literature*, Publications of the Dictionary of Old English 3 (Toronto, 1987), pp. 352–83; Graham D. Caie, ed., *The Old English Poem 'Judgement Day II,'* Anglo-Saxon Texts 2 (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 22–32; and D. R. Letson, "The Poetic Content of the Revival Homily," in *The Old English Homily and Its Backgrounds*, ed. Paul Szarmach and Bernard F. Huppé (Albany, NY, 1978), pp. 139–56. One might also mention here the work of Thomas A. Bredehoft (especially in *Early English Meter*, Toronto Old English Series 15 [Toronto, 2005] and *Authors, Audiences, and Old English Verse*, TASS [Toronto, 2009]), who has reanalysed as verse a number of texts generally considered to be Old English prose. Such reanalysis has far-reaching implications, but its metrical basis has been criticized as overly accommodating by scholars of Old English meter from Rafael J. Pascual

elsewhere that some poetic sections embedded into early English homilies that have been interpreted as borrowed fragments might instead represent original compositions,[71] and it is not impossible that the author of homily *C* wrote these verses himself in order to heighten the rhetoric during this particularly threatening part of his text.

Any hypotheses we might invent for the origin of the metrical portion of the Old English Sunday Letter homily *C* are, of course, speculative. It must be remembered that, as in the case of homily *D*, the discovery of a closer Latin source text could conceivably render any such speculation about an Anglo-Saxon author's contributions moot (though it seems unlikely to me that such a discovery would explain the *C* author's apparent use of alliterative verse). This warning should ring especially true for those of us who study Old English texts based on apocryphal sources like the Sunday Letter, the nature of which precluded in many cases the establishment of any fixed, authoritative version. It is likely that many of the peculiarities we find in Old English homilies based on such texts might be explained if we spent more time examining the manuscripts and the manuscript traditions of their sources. While such work would probably lead to a diminution in the amount of demonstrably "original" material in the corpus of Old English anonymous homilies, it would also provide us with a fuller

("Ælfric's Rhythmical Prose and the Study of Old English Metre," *English Studies* 95 [2014], 803–23, esp. 818–19) to Eric Weiskott (*English Alliterative Verse: Poetic Tradition and Literary History*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 96 [Cambridge, 2016], p. 72). See also Ian Cornelius, *Reconstructing Alliterative Verse: The Pursuit of a Medieval Meter*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 99 (Cambridge, 2017), p. 82.

[71] Stephen Pelle, "Embedded Latin Verses in Trinity Homily XXIX," *N&Q* n.s. 60 (2013), 492. For a more detailed discussion of the same text, see now Claudio Cataldi, "*Trinity Homily* XXIX *De Sancto Andrea* between Tradition and Innovation," *Anglia* 135 (2017), 641–68, esp. 646–51.

understanding of the manuscript culture in which the homilists worked and, ultimately, lead us to a better appreciation of their methods.[72]

[72] I am grateful to Jordan Zweck, who kindly read a draft of this essay and suggested many improvements, and to the reviewer for Brill.

L2 Appendix

L2 Significant Variants from the English Recension IIa Manuscripts

L3 Latin Manuscripts

K Kassel, Universitätsbibliothek – Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel und Landesbibliothek, Fol. theol. 39 (s. xiv), fol. 158r

L London, BL, Cotton Vitellius D. xi (s. xiii$^{med.}$), fols. 5v–6v

O Oxford, Merton College 13 (ca. 1478), fols. 64vb–65vb

V Vienna, Dominikanerkloster 133 (s. xv), fols. 134vb–35vb

L3 Old and Middle English Sunday Letter Texts

C London, Lambeth Palace 489 (s. xi$^{3/4}$), fols. 25r–30v

D CCCC 162 (s. xi$^{in.}$), pp. 44–52

Dur Durham University Library Cosin V.IV.2 (s. xv$^{4/4}$), fols. 125r–28v

In the following list I have identified thirty loci where the readings of manuscripts **L** and/or **O** of Recension IIa of the Latin Sunday Letter correspond more closely to the text of the Old English Sunday Letter homily *D* than the readings of **V** (the copy edited by Haines) and/or **K** (from which she reports variants). The readings of the Old English homily *C* and the Middle English sermon Dur are also given when these seem relevant. Line references to *C* and *D* are from Haines's editions (*Sunday Observance*, pp. 126–44), those to Dur from O'Mara's edition (*Study and Edition*, pp. 115–21). The readings of **V** and **K** are from Haines's edition (*Sunday Observance*, pp. 207–11), while those of **L** and **O** are derived from my own consultation of microfilms of these manuscripts. I have italicized words in some quotations for emphasis. I have not attempted to provide full transcriptions of **L** and **O** here mainly for reasons of space,

but also because more text might be recovered from the damaged sections of **L** if the manuscript were consulted in person, which I have not yet been able to do.

1. *D* 7–9: Ic … betæce and bebeode *þam bisceopum* and þam cynegum and eallum geþungenum mannum …

O: ego … mando et remando imperatoribus ac regibus, omnibus *episcopisque* potestatibus

KLV: episcopisque *omitted*

2. *D* 11–12: … forðan ðe God geworhte manega wundra on ðam sunnandæge. Þæt is þonne ærest, þæt he on ðam sunnandæge geworhte heofonas and eorðan…

O(**L**): … quia in illa die dominica multa mirabilia fecit deus; id est (**L** idem) die dominica fecit deus (**L** *omits* deus) celum et terram …

K: … in quo deus mirabilia fecit; primo fecit …

V: … in qua multa mirabilia fecit dominus …

Cf. *C* 31: he gesceop heofenan and eorðan; Dur 43–44: On þe Sonday he restytt and behelde þe perfyte warkys of þe hewyn [and] of þe erthe

Note: The manuscript source of *D* evidently had something corresponding to **K**'s "primo," but both **K** and **V** omit mention of God's creation of heaven and earth, likely because of eye-skip.

3. *D* 14–15: On sunnandæg he geworhte ealle þa ðing þe witudlice syndon gesewene and wuniað

L: die dominica fecit videlicet omnia que uidentur ac constant

O: die dominica fecit deus ex aqua uidelicet omnia que uidentur

V(**K**): die dominico fecit quattuor elementa et omnia (*for* et omnia **K** *has* ex qua uidelicet omnia) qua uidentur adque constant sunt facta

Note: This sentence evidently confused the scribes of the Latin texts. Though **K**'s reading gives the best sense, *D*'s rather awkward "ealle þa ðing þe … syndon gesewene and

wuniað" probably translates something like **L**'s (equally awkward) "omnia que uidentur ac constant."

4. *D* 22–23: And on ðam dæge *God* gebletsode .v. berene hlafas and .ii. fixas

O: die dominica benedixit *deus* quinque panes et duos pisces

V *has* Christus *for* deus; **LV** *omit*

5. *D* 28–29: … þone sunnandæg healdan fram *eallum* woruldlicum weorcum

L: … ut custodiatis diem dominicum ab *omni* opere mundano

O: … ut custodiatis diem dominicum ab *omni* opere terreno

KV: … ut custodiatis diem dominicum a mundano opere

Cf. *C* 59: fram *ælcum* geswinclicum worce; Dur 59: fro *all* ertly warkys

6. *D* 33–34: … þæt ge eow geemtigen on gebedum, and þæt ge gehyren on cirican halige bodunga

LO: … ut uacetis orationi in ecclesia et audiatis predicacionem

V: … ut uacetis, orationem dicatis in ecclesia, ut audiatis predicacionem

K: … ut uaceret id est celebraret in seruitio dei, orationem diceret in ecclesia dei et ut audiat predicationem

Note: The construction with *vacare* + dative seems to have engendered corruption in **KV**, while **LO** and *D* attest to the correct reading.

7. *D* 40–41: Þas æðelan weorc sint to healdenne … swiþost on sunnandæg

O: opera digna … maxime … custodienda sunt die dominica

L: opera digna … <m>axime … custodiendus est dominicus dies

V: opera digna … maxime … custodiendus est dies dominicus

Cf. *C* 73–74: swyðost hig syndon to healdenne on sunnandagum

Note: Both Old English texts follow **O** in applying the gerundive to *opera* rather than *dies*. The reading of **K** here is significantly different and probably corrupt.

8. *D* 43–44: ic asette on eorðan mine *feower wyrrestan* domas

O: ponam iudicia mea *pessima* in terra

KV: ponam *quattuor* iudicia mea in terram

L *illegible*

Cf. Dur 67: iiij of my most ferdfull iugementys

Note: The manuscript source of *D* evidently read "quattuor pessima." **K** breaks off soon after this clause.

9. *D* 46: swa ic dyde … Dathan and Abiron

O: sicut feci … Dathan et Abiran

V: sicut feci … Dathan, Choreb, at Abiran

L *illegible*

Cf. *C* 89–90: Dathan and Abiron; Dur 70–71: as I dyd with Dathan and Abiron

10. *D* 47–48: And ic eow gelæde *to hergienne* on þa ðeode

O: et inducam super uos gentes *ad deuastandum uos*

V: et inducam super uos gentem *deuastandum*

L *illegible*

Note: **V** is clearly defective. The sense of *D* does not precisely match **O**, either, and the Old English is perhaps slightly corrupt (should "on" be removed?), but **O**'s reading is closer.

11. *D* 50–51: heora hlisa … geswenceð *mid sare* and gegripeð eow swa þæt eacnigende wif

(**L**)**O**: apprehendet uos *in* (**L** *omits* in) *dolore* ut parturientem

V: aprehendet uos *dolor* ut parturientem

Cf. Dur 75–76: *with hertly sorow* to ȝow as to a woman trawaillyng of chylde

Note: *D* and Dur mirror **L** and **O**, which employ *dolor* as an ablative of manner or means, rather than **V**, where it seems to be functioning as a nominative subject of "aprehendet."

12. *D* 51–52: *forþi ðe* ge ne *healdað* þone halgan sunnandæg

LO: *eo quod* diem dominicum non *custoditis*

V: *si ut* (*for* autem) diem dominicum non *custodiuistis*

Cf. *C* 93–94: *forþan þe* ge ne *healdað* sunnandæges freols; Dur 76: *forþi þat* ȝe *wyll noght kepe* my Sonday

Note: The clause is clearly causal rather than conditional in *CD*Dur**LO**, and none of these follow **V** in using a past-tense verb.

13. *D* 52–53: ge onscuniað me *and ge nellað mine word gehyran*

L(**O**): me spretum habetis *et mea uerba audire non uultis* (**O** noluistis)

V: me spretum habuistis

Cf. *C* 94: ge me forseoð and mine beboda noldon (cf. **O** *noluistis*) healdan; Dur 76–78: ȝe … hafys me and my commandmentys in dispite, *ne wyll noght here þe wordys of me* to ȝow spokyn by my prestys and ministres of Haly Kerke

14. *D* 61–62: ic hine fornime and his *gewyrhtan* and his gefylstan of minum rice

L: exterminabo eum et eius *factores* suosque adiu<tores> de regno meo

OV: exterminabo eum et eius *fautores* suosque adiutores de regno meo

Cf. *C* 100: ealle þa þe him to þam unrihte fylstað (probably rendering *fautores*)

15. *D* 63–64: Ac for þære bletsunge þe *hi forhogodon on þam sunnandæge* buton yldinge wirignysse hi gemetað

(**L**)**O**: sed pro benedictione, quia *spreuereunt diem dominicam*, maledictionem sine mora inuenient (**L** incurrent sine mora)

V: sed pro benedictione, quia *spreuerunt me et mea uerba*, maledictionem meam sine mora inuenient

Cf. *C* 102: heom becymð færlice min grama ofer *for þæs dæges forsewennysse*

Note: *D*, provided it is not corrupt here, reads as if its source had something like "pro benedictione quam spreuerunt die dominica."

16. *D* 64–66: And ic asende on heora hiwrædene unarimedlice untrumnysse and cwealmas … ofer heora nytenu, forði ðe hi min word oferhogodon

(**L**)**O**: et mittam in domos illorum infirmitates et pestes innumerabiles … super pecora eorum, *eo quod spreuerunt uerba mea* (**L** uerbum <meum>)

V: et mittam in domos illorum infirmitates et pestes innumerabiles … super peccora eorum *que habent in domibus*

Cf. *C* 103–5: And ic asende ofer eow mancwealm and orfcwealm … *for minra beboda forsewennysse*; Dur 85–88: And I sall send into þaire housys innumerabyll euyls and pestelence … apon þer bestys, *forþi þat þai walde noght obey to my wordys*, ne kepe my blyssyt commandmentys

17. *D* 75–76: And hi todrifene weorþað … *forði þe* hi min gebod forhogodon

O: et dispergentur … *eo quod* spreuereunt preceptum meum

V: et dispergetur … *et quod* spreuerunt meum preceptum

L *omits this sentence*

18. *D* 78–79: fram ðære nigoðan tide þæs sæternesdæges oð *ðone morgen* on monandæg

L: ab hora <non>a <sabathi> usque *mane* in secunda feria

(**O**)**V**: ab hora nona sabathi (**O** sabbati) usque in secundam feriam

Cf. *C* 115: fram sæternesdæges none oð monandæges *lihtinge*

19. *D* 79–80: ge dæl nabbað *mid me*

O: non habebitis partem *mecum*

V: non habebitis partem *meam*

L *omits this clause*

Cf. *C* 116–17: ge ne sculon habban nænne gemanan *mid me*

20. *D* 81: gyf ge *þis* forhicgað …

O: si *hec* spreueritis …

V: si *me* spreueritis …

L *omits this clause*

Cf. Dur 104: yff þat ȝe dispyse *þis* …

21. *D* 81–82: gyf ge … ne gehyrað … *eowrum yldrum* and wisum lareowum, þe eow swuteliað *þisne weg* …

O: si … non obedieritis … *parentibus uestris* et doctoribus sapientibus *uiam istam* uobis demonstrantibus …

L: si non obedieris … doctoribus sapientibus *uiam istam* uobis demonstrantibus …

V: si … non obedieritis … *predicatoribus uestris* et docdoribus sapientibus *uiam iustam* demonstra<n>tibus …

Cf. Dur 104–6: yff þat ȝe … wyll not obey to my … *techers* (perhaps rendering *predicatoribus*) and wysemen, schewand vnto ȝow *þe ways of aylastyng lyfe* (rendering *uiam iustam* rather than *uiam istam*?)

22. *D* 82–83: onsend ic … wilde fyr

O: mittam … ignium incensiones

L: mittam … <*illegible*> incensiones

V: mittam … ignium inex::scanes (*partly illegible*)

Note: From this point on **L**, significantly abbreviated and in places illegible, no longer provides relevant readings.

23. *D* 95–96: þises middaneardes ende is swiðe neah

O: finis mundi est in limine

V: finis mundi est in lumine

Cf. *C* 132: þeos woruld is neah þam ende; Dur 128: þis werlde ys nere at an end

Note: Haines correctly suggested the emendation “limine” for “lumine.”

24. *D* 96–98: … þæt ge gebeton þa þing þe eow fram Gode forbodene wæron and on ðære ealdan cyðnysse þurh heahfæderas and witegan and on ðære niwan þurh Godes sunu ænne

O: … ut emendetis que interdicta sunt uobis a deo, etiam (*for* et) in ueteri testamento per patriarchas et prophetas, et in nouo per filium dei uiui

V: … ut emendetis ea que interdicta erant uobis a deo tam in ueteri testamento quam in nouo per patres et prophetas, per filium dei

25. *D* 99–100: … þurh þa wundru þe God *dæghwamlice* on middaneard ætyweð

O: … per miracula que ostendit deus in mundo *cotidie*

V: … per mirabilia que ostendit deus in mundo

26. *D* 102–4: Gemunað ge *weligan* þæt ge eowre wiste rihtlice gehealden … wa eow þe wyrcað dæg to nihte and niht to dæge

O: nolite ergo *diuites* diem facere de nocte et noctem de die

V: nolite ergo facere diem de nocte et noctem de die

C 132–33: And ge, *rican men*, … ne awende ge ne þone dæg to nihte ne þa niht to dæge

27. *D* 108–9: Se ðe þeowað gyfernysse *and oferdruncennysse*, hi him beoð for hlaford getealde

O: qui deseruit gule *et ebrietati* … gula *et ebrietas* est dominus suus

V: qui deseruit gule … gula erit suus dominus

28. *D* 113: Gif þonne hwilc bisceop oððe *hwilc gelæred man* …

O: si quis episcopus uel *aliquis doctus* …

V: si quis episcopus uel *clericus siue doctor* …

29. *D* 115–16: swa hwilc sacerd swa ne gebodað *þam folce* heora synna …

O: quisquis sacerdos non adnuntiat *populo meo* peccata eorum …

V: quisquis sacerdos non anucciat peccata eorum

30. *D* 126: … þurh *ealra* engla endebyrdnysse

O: …per *omnes* ordines angelorum et archangelorum

V: … per ordines angelorum

L1 Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* in Early Medieval England: A New Source for an Old English Homily (Irvine VII) in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343

Thijs Porck

Ardor refriescit, *nitor quualescit,*

Amor abolescit, lux obtenebrescit.

hat acolað, hwit asolað,

leof alaþað, leoht aþeostrað.

Senescunt quę eterna non sunt.

æghwæt ealdað þæs þe ece ne byð.[1]

These Latin-Old English proverbs, added to the Royal Psalter by an eleventh-century hand, express a theme that is central to many Old English poems and homilies: transience.[2] To express the fleeting nature of the world, Anglo-Saxon poets and homilists had a large repertoire of motifs at their disposal.[3] In addition to the well-known and frequently discussed

[1] London, BL, Royal 2. B. v, fol. 6r. "What is hot grows cool, what is white becomes dirty, what is dear becomes hateful, what is light becomes dark. Everything which is not eternal grows old." The Old English does not completely match the sense of the Latin; e.g., Latin "amor abolescit" (love will wane) and Old English "leof alaþað" (what is dear becomes hateful). Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

[2] Christine Fell, "Perceptions of Transience," in *Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge, 2nd ed., Cambridge Companions to Literature (Cambridge, 2013), 180–97.

[3] See, e.g., Hildegard L. C. Tristram, "The Early Insular Elegies: ITEM ALIA," in *Celtic Linguistics*, ed. Martin J. Ball, James Fife, Erich Poppe and Jenny Rowland (Amsterdam, 1990), pp. 348–49.

ubi sunt passages,[4] these motifs included ruined cities,[5] exhortations of the dead to the living,[6] and the elderly body in decline.[7] Sources and analogues for these elegiac motifs have been traced in various traditions, ranging from Germanic oral tradition to early Christian Latin poetry, patristic writing and Old Welsh poetic lamentations.[8]

A text that has often been associated with the Old English elegies, in particular, is the Hiberno-Latin poem *De mundi transitu* by the Irish missionary Columbanus of Bobbio (d. 616). Ida Gordon, for instance, linked Columbanus's poem to *The Seafarer*, arguing that the two poems have a number of ideas concerning transience in common, including the daily passing of this world and the brevity of earthly possessions.[9] R. F. Leslie stresses a close connection between *De mundi transitu* and *The Wanderer*, noting the similarity between Columbanus's opening lines and lines 62b–63 of the Old English poem:[10]

Mundus iste transibit

[4] J. E. Cross, "'Ubi sunt' Passages in Old English – Sources and Relationships," *Vetenskaps-Societetens i Lund Årsbok* (1956), 25–44; L. R. McCord, "A Probable Source for the *ubi sunt* Passage in Blickling Homily V," *NM* 82 (1981), 360–61; Claudia Di Sciacca, "The *ubi sunt* Motif and the Soul-and-Body Legend in Old English Homilies: Sources and Relationships," *JEGP* 105 (2006), 365–87.

[5] K. Hume, "The 'Ruin Motif' in Old English Poetry," *Anglia* 94 (1976), 339–60.

[6] J. E. Cross, "*The Dry Bones Speak* – A Theme in Some Old English Homilies," *JEGP* 56 (1957), 434–39.

[7] Thijs Porck, *Old Age in Early Medieval England: A Cultural History*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 33 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2019), pp. 81–104.

[8] See, e.g., the overview in Anne L. Klinck, *The Old English Elegies: A Critical Edition and Genre Study* (Montreal & Kingston, 1992), pp. 230–43.

[9] *The Seafarer*, ed. I. L. Gordon, Methuen's Old English Library (London, 1960), pp. 22–23.

[10] *The Wanderer*, ed. R. F. Leslie (Manchester, 1966), p. 29.

Cottidie decrescit[11]

Swa þes middangeard
ealra dogra gehwam dreoseð ond fealleþ.[12]

Leslie's identification of Columbanus as "the one who is most akin to the Old English poets of *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*" prompted Michael Allen and Daniel Calder to include *De mundi transitu* in their foundational collection of sources and analogues of Old English poetry.[13] Since then, however, the connection between this Hiberno-Latin poem and the Old English elegiac corpus has not received much attention.[14] In fact, scholars have so far been unable to establish whether Columbanus's poem actually circulated in Anglo-Saxon England.[15]

---

[11] Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, ed. and trans. G. S. M. Walker, *Sancti Columbani Opera* (Dublin, 1957), lines 1–2. "This world shall pass, daily it declines." All subsequent quotations and translations are taken from this edition. In a few places, I have made slight adjustments to Walker's translation; these are put between square brackets.

[12] *The Wanderer*, ed. Klinck, *Old English Elegies*, lines 62b–63. "Thus this world declines and falls each and every day."

[13] *The Wanderer*, ed. Leslie, p. 29; *Sources and Analogues of Old English Poetry: The Major Latin Texts in Translation*, trans. Michael J. B. Allen and Daniel G. Calder (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 135–36.

[14] E.g., Columbanus is not mentioned in the overview of sources and analogues in Klinck, *Old English Elegies*, pp. 230–43.

[15] The *Fontes* database, for instance, does not list Columbanus among its source authors. Similarly, no extant manuscripts of Columbanus's works were owned or written in England before 1100 A.D., see Gneuss/Lapidge. Nevertheless, his work was not completely unknown in early medieval England, since a number of his sermons were cited by the eighth-century Anglo-Saxon anchorite Alchfrid in a letter; see F. M. Biggs, "A Further Quotation of Columbanus in Alchfrid's Letter to Hyglac," *N&Q* n.s. 53 (2006), 12–14.

This paper, for the first time, calls attention to an Old English paraphrase of over sixty lines of Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* in the anonymous Old English composite homily Irvine VII in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343. The discovery of this source reveals a number of scribal corruptions in the extant versions of both texts and demonstrates that Columbanus's poem was indeed known in early medieval England. Below, the homily in question is first introduced, followed by a description of *De mundi transitu*. In the last part of the paper, the two relevant passages of the two texts are analysed.

L2 Irvine Homily VII in Bodley 343

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 is a mid-twelfth-century manuscript, containing a large collection of homilies and homiletic pieces in Latin and Old English.[16] The greater majority of the Latin portion of the manuscript has recently been identified as the Carolingian Homiliary of Angers,[17] while most of the manuscript's Old English items are works by Ælfric. Bodley 343 also features nine anonymous homilies, of which three are unique to this manuscript. While the language of the manuscript has been updated to the transitional English of the mid-

[16] For descriptions of this manuscript, see Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 310; Irvine, xviii–liv; Jonathan Wilcox, "Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (2406): Ælfric, 'Catholic Homilies,' other Homilies," in *Homilies by Ælfric and Other Homilies*, ASMMF 17 (Tempe, 2008), pp. 71–101; Aidan Conti & Orietta Da Rold, "Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (2406)," in *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220,* ed. Orietta Da Rold, Takako Kato, Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne (Leicester, 2010). Available at https://em1060.stanford.edu/oxford-bodleian-library-bodley-343-2406. Accessed 2018 August 31.

[17] Aidan Conti, "The Circulation of the Old English Homily in the Twelfth Century: New Evidence from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343," in *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. Aaron J. Kleist, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17 (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 365–402.

twelfth century, these unique anonymous items are considered to date to the late tenth century.[18]

The last of these three unique anonymous homilies is central to this paper. This composite homily has been edited twice, as Belfour XII "A Message from the Tomb" in 1909 and as Irvine VII "The Transience of Earthly Delights" in 1993.[19] Donald Scragg and Susan Irvine both describe the homily as consisting of two separate parts.[20] The first part (lines 1–93) ends with a typical concluding formula: "and heo mid him and mid his halȝan libbæþ, and rixæð a on eccenesse" (lines 92–93; and they will live with him and with his saints, and rule forever in eternity). This closing formula in the middle of Irvine VII makes the homily come across as disjointed. Indeed, as Irvine notes, "[t]he compiler has apparently yoked together two extracts from already existing homilies without even attempting to create any logical link between them."[21] The second part of the homily (lines 94–167) derives from an anonymous homily known as Vercelli X, versions of which are preserved in various other, earlier manuscripts. Be that as it may, the part of Irvine VII that overlaps with Vercelli X is independent from other extant versions of this homily and, despite the later date of its manuscript, it could ultimately stem from an exemplar closer to its original.[22]

The first part of Irvine VII also derives from an earlier English composition. This is confirmed by Hans Schabram's analysis of the homily's vocabulary. Primarily interested in the homily's use of words for pride, Schabram calls attention to the occurrence of the

---

[18] E.g., D. G. Scragg, "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric," in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. P. E. Szarmach, Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 5 (New York & London, 2000), pp. 93–94.

[19] Belfour, pp. 124–35; Irvine, pp. 197–202. All quotations from Irvine VII are taken from Irvine's edition.

[20] Scragg, "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies," p. 94; Irvine, p. 181.

[21] Ibid., p. 181.

[22] *VH*, p. 193.

tautological pairings "on oferhydo […] on ofermetto" (lines 11–2) and "þa modiȝæn 7 þa oferhudiȝen" (lines 71–2). The original must have had words related to the Anglian word *oferhygd* (pride) and later West Saxon scribal influence prompted the introduction of the West Saxon alternatives based on OE *mōd*. Schabram also calls attention to other Anglian traces, including the use of OE *gewinn* in the sense of "labour" (lines 85 and 90) and the Anglian form "morþer" (line 88; murder) rather than West Saxon *morþ*.[23] As such, Schabram holds that Irvine VII stems from an earlier Anglian original, which was copied by a West Saxon scribe, before it was entered into Bodley 343.

James Cross accurately described Irvine VII as "a patchwork of borrowings stressing the transitoriness of earthly things and the need to prepare for death and the Last Judgement."[24] On the basis of its contents and sources, Irvine VII may be divided into four sections:

(a) lines 1–21: An exhortation of the dead to the living, adapted from Caesarius of Arles' sermon *De Elemosinis*.[25]

(b) lines 22–65: A description of Doomsday, for which no source has been identified.

(c) lines 65–93: A reflection on the transience of earthly delights, based on Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* (discussed below). This section ends with a typical closing formula.

---

[23] Hans Schabram, *Superbia. Studien zum altenglischen Wortschatz. Teil I: Die dialektale und zeitliche Verbreitung des Wortguts* (Munich, 1965), pp. 83–84.

[24] Cross, "*The Dry Bones Speak*," p. 436.

[25] The use of this source is discussed in Cross, "*The Dry Bones Speak*," pp. 434–39, and Hilary Fox, "The Talking Dead: Exhortations of the Dead to the Living in Anglo-Saxon Writing," in *Dealing with the Dead: Mortality and Community in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Thea Tomaini, Explorations in Medieval Culture 5 (Leiden, 2018), pp. 17–24.

> (d) lines 94–167: An appeal to thank God for His benefits, a discussion of transience with *ubi sunt* passages, and another exhortation to thank God and live piously, all derived from Vercelli X.[26]

Section (a) paves the way for the themes dealt with in sections (b) and (c). The audience is first asked to consider the transience of wealth and pride whenever they look upon the graves of rich people. If the deceased were able to speak, the homilist holds, they would remind anyone that death is inevitable: "'Iu ic wæs swylc þu nu eart, and ȝyt þu iwurðæst swulc ic nu eom'" (lines 14–5; I used to be like you are now, and yet you will become as I am now). Following this *memento mori*, the homilist launches into a description of Doomsday. Having outlined the fates of the righteous and the damned, the homilist concludes:

> Þenne is us mucel neod, leofe men, þæt we Godes bodu ȝeorne healden and earniæn þæt we moten mid heofenwaræ lifes brucen, and þæt we ne weorþæn aweorpen on þa deopestæ helles grunde.[27]

In section (c), the homilist returns to the initial themes of mortality and transience. First, the inevitability of death is repeated, along with a contrast between secular wealth, which is temporary, and punishment in the afterlife, which is eternal. Next, the human body is compared to withering plants so as to suggest that, rather than loving one's fragile youth, one should be devoted to Christ's countenance and strive to earn a place in Heaven. Section (c)

---

[26] Irvine, pp. 179–81, 192–96; *VH*, pp. 191–95.

[27] Lines 63–65. "There is a great need, then, dear people, that we eagerly observe God's commandments and earn that we are allowed to enjoy life with those who live in Heaven, and that we are not thrown into the deepest pit of Hell."

ends with a description of the joys of Heaven, possibly marking the end of the text in a previous version, before it was prefixed to the passage from Vercelli X.

Although no occasion for Irvine VII is specified in Bodley 343, this homily has been associated with Rogationtide, given its themes of death, transience and Doomsday.[28] The opening lines of the homily, which entreat the audience to consider the transience of wealth as they pass by the tombs of rich men, also fit well with a Rogationtide homily. During these *gangdagas* (walking days) preceding Ascension Thursday, the community would make daily boundary walks, during which many a tomb would have been encountered.[29]

L2 Columbanus's *De mundi transitu*

The Irish monk and scholar Columbanus (d. 616) is an important figure in the history of early Christianity in Ireland and the Continent. After having spent most of his life in Bangor Abbey, he travelled to the continent as a missionary. He founded various monasteries in Francia and Italy, most notably the abbey of Bobbio in present-day Italy. In addition to a set of monastic rules and a penitential, Columbanus also wrote a number of sermons (the *Instructiones*) and letters. While still in Ireland, Columbanus had also composed "many other works suitable for singing," according to his biographer Jonas of Bobbio.[30] While various poems have been attributed to Columbanus, the authenticity of this poetic corpus has been a matter of debate. However, a strong case has been made for his authorship of *De mundi transitu*.[31]

---

[28] Irvine, p. 181.

[29] Cf. Bazire-Cross, pp. xxii–xxiv.

[30] Jonas of Bobbio, *Life of Columbanus*, trans. A. O'Hara and Ian Wood, Translated Texts for Historians 64 (Liverpool, 2017), 1.3, p. 102.

[31] The debate concerning Columbanus's poetic oeuvre is outlined in Michael Lapidge, "Epilogue: Did Columbanus Compose Metrical Verse?," in *Columbanus: Studies on the Latin Writings*, ed. Michael Lapidge (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1997), pp. 274–85. For *De mundi transitu* specifically, see Dieter Schaller, "*De mundi*

Dieter Schaller has established the authorship of Columbanus for *De mundi transitu* on the basis of correspondences in thought and phrasing with some of the Irish missionary's *Instructiones*.[32] In addition, David Howlett has shown that the greater majority of the vocabulary of *De mundi transitu* recurs elsewhere in the prose texts ascribed to Columbanus. Howlett also points out that lines 25–26 form an anagram of "Columba loquitur clanculo ridet benguirr" (Columba speaks secretly, Bangor smiles), which suggests the poem was written before Columbanus left Bangor for the Continent around the year 590 A.D.[33] An early modern annotation in the only extant manuscript that features the full text of *De mundi transitu* also attributes the poem to Columbanus.[34]

Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* is a short but highly wrought poem, written in a style that is typical for Hiberno-Latin poets of the early Middle Ages.[35] It consists of 120 heptasyllabic lines, divided into thirty stanzas of four lines each. In addition to rhyme, which occasionally extends to three syllables, the poem also features alliteration. Furthermore, Howlett has shown that Columbanus used various rhyme schemes, chiasmus, and the golden section to structure his poem. Howlett further calls attention to the work's calendrical features: seven syllables for every day in the week; four lines per stanza for every week in a

---

transitu: A Rhythmical Poem by Columbanus?," in *Columbanus*, ed. Lapidge, pp. 240–54. Cf. J. W. Smit, *Studies on the Language and Style of Columba the Younger (Columbanus)* (Amsterdam, 1971), p. 222, who rejects Columbanus as the author of this poem.

[32] Schaller, "*De mundi transitu*," pp. 252–54.

[33] David Howlett, "Two Works of Saint Columban," *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 28.1 (1993), pp. 45–46.

[34] Discussed in Schaller, "*De mundi transitu*," pp. 249–51, who concludes that the added attribution was based on an earlier tradition.

[35] For an overview of features of early Hiberno-Latin poetry, see David Howlett, "Early Insular Latin Poetry," *Peritia* 17–18 (2003–2004), 72–82.

month; thirty stanzas for every day of a month; 120 lines, ten for every month; and 365 words for every day of the year.[36]

The topic of *De mundi transitu* is the transience of earthly delights. Its first twelve lines establish that the world is fleeting and that death is inevitable. In the following seven stanzas, Columbanus muses on the futility of gaining wealth rather than bestowing it upon Christ. Next, in the eleventh stanza of the poem, he admonishes an unidentified reader to abandon this practice:

> Cogitare conuenit
> Te haec cuncta, amice
> Absit tibi amare
> Huius formulam uitae.[37]

In the following sixteen lines, Columbanus compares human beauty to sun-scorched grass, concluding that Christ's face is to be loved more than "flos carnis fragilis" (line 60; the fragile flower of flesh). The seven following stanzas list dangers that are to be avoided, including "[f]eminarum species / [p]er quas mors ingreditur" (lines 62–63; the forms of women, through whom death enters), "[p]oculum impiisimae" (line 69; the cup of a most unrighteous) and "uiam mortalium / [q]ua multis euenisse / [c]onspicis naufragium" (lines 82–84; the road of mortals, on which you [look] for many [a] shipwreck has occurred). In the last eight stanzas of the poem, Columbanus exhorts the reader to lift their heart's eyes from earthly things and focus on the joys of Heaven.

---

[36] Howlett, "Two Works," pp. 35–46.

[37] Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 41–44. "It is fitting that you think of all these things, my friend; far be it from you to love the pattern of this life."

Thus far, scholarship has only identified the Bible as one of Columbanus's sources.[38] His description of sun-scorched grass, for instance, is clearly based on the Vulgate versions of Isaiah 40:6 and James 1:10–11 (correspondences marked with italics):

Omnis en *caro foenum*
Flagrans, licet florida
Sicque *quasi flos foeni*
Omnis eius est *gloria*;

Orto sole arescit
Foenum et flos deperit;
Sic est omnis iuventus,
Virtus cum defecerit.[39]

[38] In addition, Walker, *Sancti Columbani Opera*, p. lvi, claims there are reminiscences of Ovid and Ausonius in this poem, but Smit, *Studies*, pp. 217–18, has demonstrated that the similarities that Walker points out are rather commonplace expressions.

[39] Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 45–52. "Lo, all flesh is grass, burning though green, and like as the flower of grass is all its glory; At sunrise is scorched the grass, and the flower fades; so is all youth when manhood has failed." The relevant Vulgate texts, with the Douay-Rheims translation, are: "omnis caro faenum et omnis gloria eius quasi flos agri" (Isa. 40:6; All flesh is grass, and all the glory thereof as the flower of the field) and "dives autem in humilitate sua quoniam sicut flos faeni transibit. exortus est enim sol cum ardore et arefecit faenum et flos eius decidit et decor vultus eius deperiit ita et dives in itineribus suis marcescet" (James 1:10–11; And the rich, in his being low: because as the flower of the grass shall he pass away. For the sun rose with a burning heat and parched the grass: and the flower thereof fell off, and the beauty of the shape thereof perished. So also shall the rich man fade away in his ways).

In addition to the Bible, Columbanus also appears to have made use of the late fifth-century text commonly referred to as Pseudo-Basil's *De admonitio ad filium spiritualem* (*Admonition to a Spiritual Son*). This short spiritual text was once attributed to Basil of Caesarea, but is now believed to be a work by Abbot Porcarius of Lérins, written about the year 500 A.D.[40] The eighth chapter of *De admonitio*, headed "De saeculi amore fugiendo" (Concerning Fleeing the Love of This World), includes ideas and images that are similar to lines 40–84 of *De mundi transitu.* The opening lines of Pseudo-Basil's chapter, for instance, compare worldly beauty to withered hay that is struck by summer's heat, an image that is not unlike Columbanus's scorched grass. Next, both texts extend the simile to the youthful body. According to Columbanus, "[p]ulchritudo hominum / [s]enescens delabitur. / Omnis décor pristinus / [c]um dolor raditur" (lines 53–6; the beauty of men shall vanish in old age; all former comeliness is wiped away with grief), while *De admonitio* holds "Succedente enim senectute omnis décor pristinus iuventutis floridae deperit et quos in amorem sui antea concitabat […] et quando mors venerit, tunc penitus omnis pulchritudo delebitur" (With the advent of old age, every pure beauty of florid youth is destroyed and what you loved before, you now find hateful, and when death comes, then all beauty will be totally destroyed).[41] Like

[40] See James F. LePree, "Two Recently-Discovered Passages of the Pseudo-Basil's *Admonition to a Spiritual Son* (*De admonitio ad filium spiritualem*) in Smaragdus's *Commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict* (*Expositio in regulam s. Benedicti*) and the *Letters* (*Epistolae*) of Alcuin," *Heroic Age* 11 (2008). Available at http://www.heroicage.org/issues/11/lepree.php. Accessed 2018 August 31. I follow LePree and standing tradition in referring to the author of this text as "Pseudo-Basil."

[41] Pseudo-Basil, *De admonitio ad filium spiritualem*, ed. Paul Lehmann, *Erforschung des Mittelalters. Band V* (Stuttgart, 1962), lines 224–26, p. 229; trans. J. F. LePree, "Pseudo-Basil's *De admonitio ad filium spiritualem*: A New English Translation," *Heroic Age* 13 (2010). Available at https://www.heroicage.org/issues/13/lepree2.php. Accessed 2018 August 31. Note the correspondence in

De mundi transitu, which notes that Christ's face is to be loved before all things, *De admonitio* spurs the reader to "[r]eflecte igitur ab his obscenis amoribus animum tuum et omnem amorem converte ad splendidissimam pulchritudinem Christi" (turn away therefore your soul from obscene loves and turn your love to the most splendid beauty of Christ).[42] In both texts, the exhortation to love Christ's beauty is followed by a series of dangers to be avoided, including the fatal beauty of women, cups that should not be drunk from and nets that should not be stepped on. In addition to the enumerations of similar ideas, the two texts also have various phrases in common, as the following parallel passages demonstrate:

Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 81–8	**Pseudo-Basil, *De admonitio***
Noli pronus pergere Per uiam mortalium Qua multi euenisse Conspicis *naufragium*.	Ne incedas iter, quo naufragium perpessi sunt plurimi. Evita laqueos, per quos captos ceteros senseris.[44]
Perge *iter laqueos* Cum suspensis pedibus *Per quos captos ceteros*	

phrasing between the two texts: "[p]ulchritudo [...] delabitur. Omnis decor pristinus [...]" (Columbanus) and "[...] omnis decor pristinus [...] pulchritudo delebitur" (Pseudo-Basil).

[42] Pseudo-Basil, *De admonitio ad filium spiritualem*, ed. Lehmann, lines 236–38, p. 230; trans. LePree, "Pseudo-Basil's *De admonitio*."

[44] Pseudo-Basil, *De admonitio ad filium spiritualem*, ed. Lehmann, lines 247–49, p. 230; trans. LePree, "Pseudo-Basil's *De admonitio*": "Don't set foot on the journey where you have seen many others shipwrecked. Avoid the snares which you see have captured the rest."

Incautos conperimus.[43]

A last similarity between *De mundi transitu* and *De admonitio* is that both admonish a young person, addressed with "Caue ergo, fili" by Pseudo-Basil and with "Caueto filiole" by Columbanus.[45] If Columbanus indeed drew inspiration from *De admonitio*, this would constitute the earliest known use of this influential early medieval text.[46]

De mundi transitu's only full manuscript witness is a ninth-century manuscript that once belonged to the monastery of St Gall: Zurich, Stadtbibliothek, C 78 (451), fols. 159r–60v. The text was first published in 1604 A.D. by Melchior Goldast, who collated the Zurich manuscript with another manuscript from St Gall, which has since been lost.[47] Both manuscripts appear to have been affected by some measure of scribal corruption.[48] The most dramatic consequence of the poem's faulty transmission is the loss of line 106. Instead of providing a full seven-syllable line for this line, eyeskip has led a scribe to repeat a part of line 102, instead.[49] As a result, extant editions of the poem either leave line 106 empty or fill in a heptasyllabic line of their own.[50]

---

[43] "Do not plunge headlong by the road of mortals, on which you [look] for many [a] shipwreck has occurred. Step between the nets with hesitant feet, for by those nets the rest we see were caught unawares." Correspondences in phrasing are marked with italics.

[45] Pseudo-Basil, *De admonitio ad filium spiritualem*, ed. Lehmann, line 245, p. 230; Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, line 61.

[46] Cf. LePree, "Two Recently-Discovered Passages."

[47] Melchior Goldast, *Paraeneticorum Veterum, pars I* (Lindau, 1604), p. 153.

[48] Schaller, "*De mundi transitu*," p. 242.

[49] Schaller, "*De mundi transitu*," p. 244, n. 28.

[50] Walker leaves line 106 blank; Howlett, "Two Works," pp. 35–36, emends line 106 with "Melos decantata est" (a song is sung right through); Schaller, "*De mundi transitu*," p. 244, n. 28, opts for "canticis repleta est" (which

A new critical edition of *De mundi transitu* seems necessary in the light of a hitherto overlooked quotation of the poem that allows for the reconstruction of line 106. This quotation is found in Sedulius Scottus's *Collectaneum miscellaneum*, a ninth-century florilegium of mostly biblical and patristic sources. In section XVIII "De die iudicii" (Concerning Doomsday), presented as prose and misleadingly attributed to Saint Augustine of Hippo, are six stanzas (lines 93–96 and 101–120) from Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* (here indicated in italics):

> AVGVSTINVS: Tunc dicetur morti ubi est contentio tua, et non erit, et item dicetur ubi est, mors, aculeus tuus, et nusquam erit. Regnabimus igitur cum Domino nostro Iesu Christo in illa *beata familia quae in astris habitat: ubi senex non gemit, neque infans uagitat; ubi cibo superno plebs caelestis pascitur; ubi nemo moritur quod nemo nascitur; ubi aula regia* regis summi sita est, *in qua male resonans nulla uox audita est; ubi uita uiridis uera que futura est, quam nec mortis meroris meta consumptura est. Leti letantes acto letum regem uidebunt, cum regnante regnabunt, cum gaudente gaudebunt. Tunc dolor, tunc taedium, tunc labor delebitur. Tunc rex regum, rex mundus a mundis uidebitur.* Ibi esse nostrum non habebit mortem, ibi nosse nostrum non habebit errorem, ibi amare nostrum non habebit offensionem.[51]

---

is refilled with songs). The emendations by Howlett and Schaller both anticipate lines 107–8: "In qua male resonans / [n]ulla vox audita est" (in which resounding ill no voice is heard).

[51] Sedulius Scottus, *Collectaneum miscellaneum,* CCCM 67, ed. Dean Simpson (Turnhout, 1988), XVIII.29, lines 123–36. "Then it is said to death 'where is your contention?', and it will not be, and again it is said, 'where, death, is your sting?', and it will not be anywhere. Therefore, we will reign with our Lord Jesus Christ with that *blessed family which dwells among the stars: where the old does not groan, nor the infant cry; where on celestial food the heavenly folk are fed; where no one dies because no one is born; where the royal hall* of the highest king is located*, in which, resounding ill, no voice is heard; where life green and true shall be, which*

The attribution of this entire passage to Augustine is based on the fact that the material that surrounds the quotation from Columbanus, though not the quotation itself, indeed comes from works of Augustine.[52]

The discovery of this quotation is significant. For one, the text in Scottus's *Collectaneum* provides a number of alternative readings, such as "beata familia quae in astris habitat" (blessed family which dwells among the stars) for the Zurich manuscript's "beata familia, quae in altis habitat" (blessed family which dwells on high) (lines 93–94). More crucially, Scottus appears to have preserved the lost line 106 of *De mundi transitu*:

Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 101–12	**Sedulius Scottus, *Collectaneum***
Ubi cibo superno	ubi cibo superno
Plebs caelestis pascitur,	plebs caelestis pascitur;
Ubi nemo moritur	ubi nemo moritur

neither death nor [the fear of sorrow] shall destroy. Joyful after crossing death they shall see their joyful king, with Him reigning they shall reign, with Him rejoicing they shall rejoice. Then grief, then weariness, then toil shall be done away, then the King of kings, the pure King, shall be seen by the pure. There our being will not have death, there our knowing will have no fault, there our loving will have no misfortune." For the translation of the italicized lines that correspond with Columbanus's *De mundi transitu*, I have used Walker's translation.

[52] The lines preceding the quotation from *De mundi transitu* are from Augustine's *Sermones*; the lines following are from *De ciuitate Dei*. See F. Dolbeau, *Supplement*, CCM LXVII Supplementum (Turnhout, 1990), pp. 30–31. Notably, at least one other quotation of Columbanus, from his *Instructiones*, in Scottus's *Collectaneum* is similarly introduced by a quotation from Augustine and, hence, attributed to "AVGVSTINVS," Scottus, *Collectaneum*, ed. Simpson, XVI.16–24. Another citation from the *Instructiones* is attributed to "FAVSTVS," Scottus, *Collectaneum*, ed. Simpson, XVII.7. The identification of sources was added in the margins of the text by a scribe and may not be original. See Scottus, *Collectaneum*, ed. Simpson, xi, xxx–xxxi.

Quia nemo nascitur,	quod nemo nascitur;
Ubi aula regia	ubi aula regia
. . . . .	*regis summi sita est,*
In qua male resonans	in qua male resonans
Nulla vox audita est,	nulla uox audita est;
Ubi vita viridis	ubi uita uiridis
Veraque futura est,	uera que futura est,
Quam nec mors nec meroris	quam nec mortis meroris
Metus consumpturus est.[53]	meta consumptura est.[54]

The line "regis summi sita est" in Scottus's *Collectaneum* may well have been part of Columbanus's original poem: it has seven syllables and a trisyllabic rhyme with line 108 "Nulla vox audita est."[55] Moreover, the reconstructed lines "ubi aula regia / regis summi sita est" (lines 105–6; where the royal hall of the highest king is located) more or less correspond to the Old English phrase "ac þær is þæs hestæn kynges kynerice" (line 90; but there is the kingdom of the highest king) in Irvine VII, which also uses passages of *De mundi transitu* that were not copied in Scottus's *Collectaneum*. In other words, Scottus's *Collectaneum* and Irvine

[53] "Where on celestial food the heavenly folk are fed; where no one dies because no one is born; where the royal hall … , in which resounding ill no voice is heard; where life green and true shall be, which neither death nor [the fear of sorrow] shall destroy."

[54] Scottus, *Collectaneum* ed. Simpson, XVIII.29, lines 127–31.

[55] An alternative explanation, that Scottus copied a version of the text that is similar to the one preserved in the Zurich manuscript, noticed the error and supplied the missing line himself is less likely, since such emendations are not strictly necessary in a collection that probably functioned as a notebook. Cf. Scottus, *Collectaneum*, ed. Simpson, xxii.

VII, as two independent witnesses, allow for the reconstruction of the missing line of Columbanus's *De mundi transitu*. As a result, this poem by one of Ireland's earliest Latin poets is once again complete.

L2 Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* as a source of Irvine Homily VII

Finding sources has long been a valued method when it comes to studying Old English homilies. The identification of a source provides information that may be used to establish matters of textual criticism and to gain an insight into the methods of Anglo-Saxon homilists, and it allows for the reconstruction of the intellectual milieu in which these homilists operated.[56] After establishing the parameters for identifying Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* as a source for Irvine VII, the remainder of this paper features an analysis of the corresponding passages.

In order to identify a source conclusively, relative chronology needs to be considered, as well as the question of whether the source could have been available to the borrower. For the use of Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* in Irvine VII, the relative dates of the two texts are unproblematic: the proposed late sixth-century Latin source certainly predates the Old English homily in Bodley 343, which may have been based on a tenth-century exemplar. While no Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of *De mundi transitu* survive, the poem may have become available in England via the monastery of St Gall. This monastery had close ties to

[56] For appraisals of source study, in particular with relation to homilies, see James E. Cross, "The Literate Anglo-Saxon – On Sources and Disseminations," *PBA* 58 (1972), 67–100; D. G. Scragg, "Source Study," in *Reading Old English Texts*, ed. Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 39–58; Charles D. Wright, "Old English Homilies and Latin Sources," in *The Old English Homily*, ed. Kleist, pp. 15–66. On the potential pitfalls of source study, see Pelle's essay above, p. 000.

Anglo-Saxon England and its library contained at least two manuscripts of the poem.[57] A third prerequisite for the identification of a source is the exclusion of coincidental similarity.[58] In the case of Irvine VII and Columbanus's *De mundi transitu*, the sheer number of correspondences, both in terms of ideas and phrasing, is so substantial that the similarity is unlikely to have arisen without the Old English homilist having read the Hiberno-Latin poem, either directly or indirectly.[59]

Since both the first half of Irvine VII and most of Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* survive only in single manuscripts, scribal corruption may have gone unnoticed. As such, a comparison between corresponding passages of the two texts may give cause for emendation. The four opening lines of *De mundi transitu* and its Old English adaptation are a case in point:

Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 1–4	**Irvine VII, lines 65–69**
Mundus iste transibit,	For þam þe we iseoð þis læne lif mid
Cottidie decrescit;	fræcednesse and mid mycele earfoðnesse ifulled,
Nemo vivens manebit,	and ylce dæȝ þis lif wonæð and wursæð; and na
Nullus vivus remansit.[60]	

[57] For the ties with Anglo-Saxon England, see, e.g., J. M. Clark, *The Abbey of St Gall as a Centre of Literature & Art* (Cambridge, 1926), pp. 55–69.

[58] Scragg, "Source Study," p. 41.

[59] There is, of course, always the possibility of an intermediary source, such as a *florilegium.* Cf. Wright, "Old English Homilies and Latin Sources," p. 17. Part of Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* circulated in the ninth-century florilegium *Collectaneum miscellaneum* by Sedulius Scottus, as established above.

[60] "This world shall pass, daily it declines; none shall remain living, no one has remained alive."

lifiende mon ne þurhwune(ð) on þisse weorlde,
ne nan eft to lafe ne wurð.[61]

Without knowledge of the Latin source, Irvine has suggested that the problematic phrase "ne nan eft to lafe ne wurð" in Irvine VII could be corrected by changing "lafe" into "life,"[62] rendering the translation 'and no one becomes alive again'—what is dead stays dead. The emendation of "to lafe" to "to life" seems supported by the Latin "vivus" (alive) in "Nullus vivus remansit."[63]

Irvine VII's rendition of the next four lines of *De mundi transitu* are suggestive of scribal corruption in the Latin text:

Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 5–8	**Irvine VII, lines 69–70**
Totum humanum genus	Al moncyn is ilice on þas weorld icenned, þeah
Ortu utitur pari,	heore lif beo syððæn unilic; and heo æft on ende
Et de simili vita	alle ȝewitæð.[65]
Fine cadit aequali[64]	

[61] "Because we see this transitory life filled with danger and with great difficulty, and every day this life wanes and grows worse; and no living man remains in this world, nor does anyone become what is left[?] afterwards."

[62] Irvine, p. 203.

[63] Arguably, the clause "ne nan eft to lafe ne wurð" could be translated as something like "nor will one become as a remnant afterwards, i.e. nor will anyone remain after"; in which case there is no need to explain "lafe" as an error for "life," since the implication would be that there will be no surviving living persons. I owe this suggestion to the anonymous reviewer.

[64] "The whole human race uses a like origin, and after a common life falls by an equal ending."

[65] "All mankind is born alike into this world, although their life will be unlike afterwards; and again they all depart in the end."

The sense of the Old English text here appears superior to that of the Latin: every human starts and ends life in the same manner, even though they lead different lives. The Latin poem's notion that the whole human race leads a "simili vita" (a similar life) strikes as odd. Perhaps "de simili" is a scribal corruption of the ablative form of *dissimilis* (unlike, dissimilar), "dissimili." Alternatively, the Old English homilist caught on to the unlikely notion that all people lead similar lives and decided to correct the sense of the Latin source.

The next four lines in Columbanus's *De mundi transitu*, which outline the inevitability of death, correspond with the Old English in overall sense and phrasing:

Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 9–12	**Irvine VII, lines 70–2**
Differentibus vitam	Ne nan swa longe her on weorlde ne leofæð, þæt
Mors incerta subripit,	eft þe deaþ hine ne ȝenime, and þa modiȝæn and
Omnes superbos vagos	þa oferhudiȝen deaþes gneornung gripð.[67]
Meror mortis corripit.[66]	

With respect to Schabram's analysis of the words for pride in Irvine VII, it is interesting to note that the tautological word pair "þa modiȝæn and þa oferhudiȝen" here renders a single Latin phrase "superbos vagos." As such, it is indeed possible that the West Saxon "modiȝæn" was added to clarify the Anglian "oferhudiȝen" in the course of this text's transmission, as Schabram has suggested.[68]

---

[66] "For those who postpone life death creeps on unsure, all the proud wanderers sorrow of death seizes."

[67] "No one lives so long here on the world that death does not take him then, and the grief of death grabs the proud ones and the overconfident ones."

[68] Cf. Schabram, *Superbia*, pp. 83–84.

The next two stanzas of Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* deal with the impermanence of earthly possessions. The Old English follows the Latin closely:

Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 13–20	**Irvine VII, lines 72–77**
Quod pro Christo largiri	And þæt heo her for Godes lufe syllen nolden
Nolunt, omnes avari	heoræ sawle to hælpe, heo hit rædlice forlæteð,
Inportune amittunt;	and oðre þerto foð, þa heo for Criste hit letæn
Post se colligunt alii.	nolden, þa hwile þe heo lifedon. Ac þenne þe
	deaþ cymæð, þenne sceolen heo forlæten heoræ
Parvum ipsi viventes	æhtæ heoræ unðancæs, and heo his þenne nan
Deo dare vix audent;	þing nabbæð.[70]
Morti cuncta relinquunt,	
Nihil de ipsis habent.[69]	

The sentence structure in the Old English is somewhat obscure and Irvine explains that "[t]he direct object of *syllen* (73) is *þæt* (72) meaning 'that which'. This is picked up by the pronoun *hit* in 73 and 74, and by the partitive genitive *his* in 76. Its meaning is made explicit in *heoræ*

[69] "What to bestow for Christ they will not, all misers lose out of season; after them others gather. Living but little themselves, they scarce venture to give to God; to death they leave their all, they keep nothing of themselves."

[70] "And that which they did not want to give here for God's love to help their soul, they shall leave it soon, and others succeed thereto, since they did not want to give it up for Christ, during the time that they lived. But when death comes, they must leave their possessions against their will, and they will then have nothing of this."

æhtæ (76)."[71] Irvine's interpretation of the Old English is confirmed by the Latin source text; in fact, the Old English word order "þæt heo her for Godes lufe syllen nolden" may well show the influence of Latin "quod pro Christo largiri nolunt."

The next stanza of Columbanus's poem is translated almost *ad litteram* in the Old English homily:

Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 21–24	**Irvine VII, lines 77–78**
Cottidie decrescit	Ylce dæȝ þis andwearde lif wonæð þe we
Vita praesens quam amant;	lufiæð, ac þa pine ne woniæð þam monnum þe
Indeficiens manebit	heom nu æfter earniæð.[73]
Sibi poena quam parant.[72]	

The word "pine" in the Old English text merits a comment here. The first instances of the word *pīn* meaning "pain, torment" in English are all found in twelfth-century manuscripts; as such, Irvine has suggested that the word, which is used three times in this homily (ll. 55, 77, 157) probably represents a Middle English gloss to the Old English *wīte* "pain, torment."[74] While this is possible, it is noteworthy that the use of the word "pine" in this passage may reflect the Latin "poena," which is also the origin of the word in English. If so, the history of

[71] Irvine, p. 203; Irvine's explanation of the structure of this sentence is likely a reaction to Belfour's incorrect insertion of a direct object "(their life)" in the translation of this passage: "And because they here would not give (their life) for the love of God to help their soul they shall soon lose it, and the others shall obtain it, since they would not give it up for Christ's sake while they were living." (cf. Belfour, p. 129).

[72] "Daily declines the present life they love; unfailing remains the penalty they prepare for themselves."

[73] "Every day this present life which we love diminishes, but the torments do not diminish for the people who are now earning them for afterwards."

[74] Irvine, p. 203.

the word may stretch back to the pre-Ælfrician Anglian original of this part of the homily in Bodley 343.

Lines 25–40 of *De mundi transitu*, which outline how sinners are unaware of the torments being prepared for them in Hell, are not included in Irvine VII. Since the composer of this composite homily had expanded on the horrors of Hell in the section preceding the rendition of Columbanus's poem, the lines may have been considered too repetitive.

Instead, the homily moves on to a reflection on the frailty of the human body, again following Columbanus in comparing the human body to a plant withered in the sun's heat:

Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 41–56	**Irvine VII, lines 79–83**
Cogitare convenit Te haec cuncta, amice. Absit tibi amare Huius formulam vitae. Omnis en caro foenum Flagrans, licet florida, Sicque quasi flos foeni Omnis eius est gloria; Orto sole arescit Foenum et flos deperit;	Uton we þenne, leofe men, þas þing alle ȝemunen and iþencean þæt þæt mennisce lichame is swa blowende wurten, þe for þare sunnæ hæte fordruȝiæð and forscrincæð. Swa eac þæs monnes ȝeoȝeþæ and fegernes dæþ. Þenne þeo ælde on him siȝæð mid unhæle, all þare ȝeoȝeðe feȝernes aweȝ awit and forwurð.[76]

[76] "Let us then, dear men, remember all these things and consider that the human body is like blossoming plants, which dry up and wither because of the sun's heat. So, too, do a person's youth and fairness. When old age seizes on him with ill health, all fairness of youth goes away and withers."

Sic est omnis iuventus,

Virtus cum defecerit.

Pulchritudo hominum

Senescens delabitur.

Omnis decor pristinus

cum dolore raditur.[75]

The Old English is an abbreviation of the Latin in that the images of grass and flowers are replaced by the simple "blowende wurten" (blooming plants). Irvine found a close analogue to this passage in Blickling V:

> We witon þæt Crist sylfa cwæþ þurh his sylfes muþ, 'þonne ge geseoþ growende & blowende ealle eorþan wæstmas, & þa swetan stencas gestincað þara wudu-wyrta, þa sona eft adrugiaþ & forþgewitaþ for þæs sumores hæton'. Swa þonne gelice bið þære menniscan gecynde þæs lichoman þonne se geogoþhad ærest bloweþ & fægerost bið, he þonne raþe se wlite eft gewiteþ & to ylde gecyrreþ, & he þonne siþþon mid sare geswenced bið, mid mislicum ecum & tyddernessum. & eal se lichoma geunlustaþ þa geogoðlustas to fremmenne þa þe he ær hatheortlice lufode, & him swete wæron to aræfnenne.[77]

---

[75] "It is fitting that you think of all these things, my friend. Far be it from you to love the pattern of this life. Lo, all flesh is grass, burning though green, and like as the flower of grass is all its glory; At sunrise is scorched the grass, and the flower fades; so is all youth when manhood has failed. The beauty of men shall vanish in old age. All former comeliness is wiped away with grief."

[77] *BH*, pp. 57–59. "We know that Christ himself said, through his own mouth: 'When you see all the earth's fruits growing and blooming, and smell the sweet odours of the plants, then immediately afterwards they shall

The Blickling homilist's comparison of the elderly body in decline to blooming plants withering away in the heat is indeed similar to the image used in Irvine VII. However, as I have discussed elsewhere,[78] Blickling V here draws on Pseudo-Basil's *De admonitio ad filium spiritualem*, the same source used by Columbanus.

The next passages in Columbanus's poem and Irvine VII urge the audience to love Christ's countenance rather than the frail youthful state of the body:

Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 57–60	**Irvine VII, lines 83–85**
Vultus Christi radius	Ac Cristes ansyne is to lufiȝenne ofer alle oðer
Prae cunctis amabilis	þing mucele swiðor þenne þes lichames
Magis diligendus est	ȝeoȝæðhad.[80]
Quam flos carnis fragilis.[79]	

As established above, this exhortation to love Christ's beauty above all else ultimately derives from Pseudo-Basil's *De admonitio*.

The next seven stanzas of Columbanus's poem, which warn the reader about the dangers of women, drinking and lust, are not incorporated in the Old English homily. Since

---

dry up and wither away because of the summer's heat.' So, it (the fruit) is like the nature of a man's body, when youth first blooms and is fairest, then quickly beauty fades and turns to old age, and afterwards he is troubled by pain and by various ailments and infirmities. And the whole body loathes to perform those youthful lusts that he loved so earnestly before, and which were sweet to him to perform." Cf. Irvine, p. 191.

[78] Porck, *Old Age in Early Medieval England*, pp. 95–97.

[79] "The radiance of Christ's face, lovely before all things, is more to be desired than the frail flower of flesh."

[80] "But Christ's countenance is to be loved over all other things, much more than the youth of the body."

these stanzas feature a rather negative depiction of women, the omission may indicate that this homily catered to a mixed, lay audience. Indeed, if this homily was intended for Rogationtide, as has been suggested, the homily would likely address a wide audience, consisting of both men and women.[81]

When the Old English homily takes up Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* again, it is to remind the audience to focus on Heaven:

Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 89–104	**Irvine VII, lines 85–90**
De terrenis eleva	Ac habbæþ eowre heorte on þisse eorþlice
Tui cordis oculos;	ȝewinne and earniæþ eow þæt heofenlice rice,
Ama amantissimos	þær is ece eadiȝnesse: þær eald ne graneð, ne
Angelorum populos;	child ne scræmeð. Ne bið þær þurst, ne hungor,
	ne wop, ne teoðe ȝegrind, ne morþer, ne man, ne
Beata familia,	þær nan ne swæltæð, for þam ðe þær ne byð nan
Quae in altis habitat,	acenned; ne þer ne byð sar, ne seoreȝæ, ne nan
Ubi senex non gemat,	longing, ne unlustes ȝewin.[83]

[81] Blickling X, a homily associated with Rogationtide, addresses its audience as "ge weras ge wif, ge geonge ge ealde, ge snotre ge unwise, ge þa welegan ge þa þearfan" (men or women, young or old, wise or unwise, wealthy or poor), see Milton McC. Gatch, "The Unknowable Audience of the Blickling Homilies," *ASE* 18 (1989), 108–10. On the mixed audience of vernacular Rogationtide homilies, see also Johanna Kramer, *Between Earth and Heaven: Liminality and the Ascension of Christ in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, Manchester Medieval Literature and Culture (Manchester, 2014), p. 187, n. 3.

[83] "But have? your heart on this earthly labour and earn for yourself that heavenly kingdom; there is eternal happiness: there the old does not groan, nor does the child scream. Nor is there thirst, or hunger, or weeping, or grinding of teeth, or murder, or evil, one does not die there because no one is born there; there is no pain, or sorrow, or longing or conflict of evil desire."

Neque infans vagiat

Ubi laudis Domini
Nulla vox retinetur,
Ubi non esuritur,
Ubi numquam sititur,

Ubi cibo superno
Plebs caelestis pascitur,
Ubi nemo moritur
Quia nemo nascitur[82]

Comparison with the Latin source makes clear that the Old English "habbæþ" (have) is likely a corrupted form of "hebbæþ" (lift)—the audience is asked to lift their heart from earthly matters so as to gain the heavenly kingdom. The Old English homily has retained a number of Columbanus's unique celestial features, such as "Ubi senex non gemat, / Neque infans vagiat" (lines 95–96; cf. "þær eald ne graneð, ne child ne scræmeð") and "Ubi nemo moritur / Quia nemo nascitur" (lines 103–4; cf. "ne þær nan ne swæltæð, for þam ðe þær ne byð nan acenned"). These idiosyncratic features are supplemented by more commonplace descriptions of the joys of Heaven, such as the presence of eternal happiness, and the absence of weeping, grinding of teeth, murder, evil, pain and sorrow. Hildegard Tristram has shown that such enumerations of celestial joys, in both positive and negative form, are frequently found in Old

[82] "From earthly things lift up your heart's eyes; love the most loving hosts of angels; blessed family which dwells on high, where the old does not groan nor the infant cry, where of God's praise no voice is restrained, where there is no hunger, where there is never thirst, where on celestial food the heavenly folk are fed, where none dies because none is born."

English homilies.[84] Blickling VIII features a typical example of the pattern that shows some similarity to the description of Heaven in Irvine VII:

> Þær biþ a ece gefea buton unrotnesse, & geogoþ buton yldo. Ne biþ þær sar ne gewinn, ne nænig uneþnes, ne sorg ne wop, ne hungor, ne þurst, ne ece yfel. Ne þær mon his feond findeð, ne his freond forlæteþ.[85]

As such, whilst incorporating Columbanus's idiosyncratic *De mundi transitu* into Irvine VII, the homilist occasionally fell back on homiletic clichés.

A similar strategy was followed in the adaptation of the last lines of Columbanus's poem, which describe the rejoicing of the faithful when they are allowed to see God in Heaven. The Old English follows the sense of these last stanzas, but in an abbreviated form:

Columbanus, *De mundi transitu*, lines 105–16	**Irvine VII, lines 90–93**
Ubi aula regia	
[regis summi sita est]	Ac þær is þæs hestæn kynges kynerice, and þær
In qua male resonans	wuniæþ alle þa þe Godes bodu heolden on ece
Nulla vox audita est,	murhðe; and heo dæȝhwamlice þene heofenlice
Ubi vita viridis	

[84] Hildegard L. C. Tristram, "Stock Descriptions of Heaven and Hell in Old English Prose and Poetry," *NM* 79 (1978), 102–13.

[85] *BH*, pp. 103–5. "There is eternal joy without sadness and youth without old age. There is no grief or labour, or any uneasiness, or sorrow, or weeping, or hunger, or thirst, or eternal evil. There no man finds his enemy or abandons his friend."

Veraque futura est,
Quam nec mors nec meroris
Metus consumpturus est.

Laeti leto transacto
Laetum regem videbunt;
Cum regnante regnabunt,
Cum gaudente gaudebunt.[86]

kyng bliðne iseoð, and heo mid him and mid his halȝan libbæþ, and rixæð a on eccenesse.[87]

Some details of *De mundi transitu* are retained in the Old English text, such as the notion that the dead will see a joyful king in Heaven. In addition, as noted above, the Old English phrase "[a]c þær is þæs hestæn kynges kynerice" corresponds to lines 105–6 of *De mundi transitu*, as reconstructed on the basis of Scottus Sedulius's *Collectaneum miscellaneum*. The homilist of Irvine VII has not only abbreviated this part of the source text, but also combined it with a typical closing formula. Similar formulas are found throughout the Old English homiletic corpus, including another anonymous homily in Bodley 343, Irvine V, which ends with an exhortation to aid God, "þe ðe leofæð and rixæð a a on ecenesse. AMEN" (who lives and rules forever in eternity. Amen).[88]

L2 Conclusion

[86] "Where the royal hall (of the highest king is situated), in which resounding ill no voice is heard, where life green and true shall be, which neither death nor [the fear of sorrow] shall destroy. Joyful after crossing death they shall see their joyful king; with him reigning they shall reign, with him rejoicing they shall rejoice."

[87] "But there is the kingdom of the highest king, and there dwell all those who observed God's commandments in eternal happiness; and they will daily see the joyous heavenly king, and they will live with him and with his saints, and they will reign forever in eternity."

[88] Irvine, p. 143, lines 189–90.

In composing an Old English homily on the fleeting nature of earthly joys, an anonymous Anglo-Saxon homilist turned to the Hiberno-Latin poem *De mundi transitu*. This homilist clearly understood the poem's contents and recognized its relevance for the theme of his homily. While his adaptation stays close to the sense of his source, nothing of Columbanus's highly complex form and structure appears to have been retained in the Old English text. Instead, the poem has been transformed into relatively unembellished prose and occasionally mixed with homiletic commonplaces.

In a foundational article on source criticism, Charles Wright described the research into the sources of Old English homilies as ultimately "unfinished business."[89] Indeed, the identification of Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* as a source for an anonymous Old English composite homily in Bodley 343 raises more questions than have been answered in this paper. Aside from the matters of textual criticism dealt with above, scholars may wish to investigate the exact manner of how the Latin poem was transposed into Old English and how the treatment of this source compares to how this homily's other sources were transformed in the process of composition. For the study of the Hiberno-Latin source text, its use in an Old English homily also triggers various questions, such as how it became available in early medieval England and whether its manuscript transmission may be suggestive of earlier homiletic application. Moreover, in light of the poem's noted similarities to the Old English elegies, Columbanus's *De mundi transitu* as a potential analogue of these Old English poems may deserve more than a passing mention.

[89] Wright, "Old English Homilies and Latin Sources," p. 60.

L1 Jews and Judaizing as Pathologies in the Anglo-Saxon Imagination: Toward a Theory of Early Somatic Anti-Judaism

Samantha Zacher

A prevalent image of Jews in the high Middle Ages was the *Judensau*, which depicted, in a variety of configurations, Jews sucking from the teats of a female pig while simultaneously being shat on.[1] The figures in the image are always recognizably Jewish: they wear obligatory Jewish hats and badges; or they have stereotypical Jewish features; or their clothing has Hebrew letters inscribed on it. Sometimes the Jews are eating the excrement of the pig, and sometimes examining it (or the anus itself) for the holy name of God (the *Shem HaMephorash*), or for teachings from the Talmud.[2] The image is disturbing for many reasons:

---

[1] On the figure of the *Judensau*, see especially Isaiah Shachar, *The Judensau: A Medieval Anti-Jewish Motif and its History*, Warburg Institute Surveys 5 (London, 1974); and Birgit Wiedl, "Laughing at the Beast: the *Judensau*: Anti-Jewish Propaganda and Humor from the Middle Ages to the Early Modern Period," in *Laughter in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times: Epistemology of a Fundamental Human Behavior, Its Meaning, and Consequences*, ed. Albrecht Classen (New York, 2010), pp. 325–64. I thank Peter Gilgen for reading this essay before publication, and for his characteristically excellent suggestions and comments. I am also grateful to Winfried Rudolf and Susan Irvine for organizing the wonderful conference on homilies at which a version of this paper was first delivered.

[2] A particularly detailed example of the *Judensau* can be found in Saint Mary's church of Heiligenstadt, just south of Göttingen. Martin Luther used the depiction of the *Judensau*, located on the exterior wall of St. Mary's Church in Wittenberg, as the basis for the cover of his *Vom Schem Hamphoras, und vom Geschlecht Christi: Matthei am i. Capitel* (Wittenberg, 1543). The "Shem Hamaphoras" in the title of this treatise refers to the Holy and Hidden name of God, also known as the Tetragrammaton; the Judensau image links Jews to religious perversion and idolatry. Luther explained the image in paragraph 59 of his treatise as follows: "Here at

it violates and profanes the laws of kashrut which forbid the eating of pork; it associates Jews with obsessive carnality, gluttony, excrement, and profanation; it infantilizes, effeminizes, and animalizes those sucking at the sow's teat; and the location of the holy writings or the name of God within the belly or anus of the sow associates the Jews with idolatry and perversion. The Jews in this image are caught in a cycle of eating, defecating, and wasteful consumption, not to mention possible sexual offenses and apostasy. The *Judensau* was especially popular in Germany from the twelfth century onwards, and was typically exhibited in public places and main thoroughfares, including bridges, building edifices, and churches. For the purposes of this essay, the *Judensau* will serve as a graphic representation for the whole complex of sins, vices, and excesses associated with the Jewish body.

No depictions of the *Judensau* were likely to have existed in Anglo-Saxon England. This has less to do with the developing ideologies about Jews, and more to do with the relatively slow advancement of anti-Judaic images relative to their textual counterparts.[3]

Wittenberg, in our parish church, there is a sow carved into the stone under which lie young pigs and Jews who are sucking; behind the sow stands a rabbi who is lifting up the right leg of the sow, raises the behind of the sow, bows down and looks with great effort into the Talmud under the sow, as if he wanted to read and see something most difficult and exceptional; no doubt they gained their Shem Hamaphoras in that place." (trans. Gerhard Falk, *The Jew in Christian Theology: Martin Luther's Anti-Jewish Vom Schem Hamphoras, Previously Unpublished in English, and Other Milestones in Church Doctrine Concerning Judaism* [Jefferson, N. C., 1992], pp. 182–83).

[3] On the generally positive representation of Ancient Israelites and Jews in Anglo-Saxon art, see the articles by Catherine E. Karkov, Asa Mittman, and Adam S. Cohen in *Imagining the Jew in Anglo-Saxon Literature and Culture*, ed. Samantha Zacher, TASS 21 (Toronto, 2016). For depictions of Israelites in Anglo-Saxon translations of Old Testament books, see Herbert R. Broderick, *Moses the Egyptian in the Illustrated Old English Hexateuch (London, British Library Cotton MS Claudius B.IV)* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 2017); Catherine E. Karkov, "The Anglo-Saxon Genesis: Text, Illustration, and Audience," in *The Old English Hexateuch: Aspects and Approaches*, ed. Rebecca Barnhouse and B. C. Withers (Kalamazoo, 2000); and Benjamin C.

Indeed, traces of a similar somatic anti-Judaic rhetoric can be found in writings from the Anglo-Saxon period. One of the more pernicious examples of anti-Judaism can be found in the anonymous, tenth-century homily Vercelli VII (in Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII), which depicts Jews as depraved and gluttonous idolaters. It does so by citing and altering the original wording of Paul's Philippians 3:19, so that his general reference to "the enemies of God" is made to specify the "Jews who thought their belly was their God." Andrew P. Scheil addressed this aspect of the homily in his book *The Footsteps of Israel*, when he claimed that the homily represented a rare and even precocious form of somatic anti-Judaism, of the type usually associated with the High Middle Ages.[4] What Scheil found so disturbing, and so anachronous about the anti-Judaic content of the homily, was its fierce bodily essentialism and lurid somatic critique. He wrote: "if Jews are associated with gluttony, it follows also that they lurch along in the imaginative associations of the homily as a mass of contagion, disgust, and disease."[5] For Scheil, Vercelli VII anomalously prefigured a series of anti-Semitic fantasies that would dominate in the iconography for Jews in the High Middle Ages—namely, that they "poisoned wells; spread the plague; desecrated the Host in secret ceremonies; engaged in ritual murder, had horns, tails, and other physical deformities."[6] To be sure, this is the cultural milieu that produced images like the *Judensau*.

Scheil was undoubtedly right about the presence of these themes in Vercelli VII, and about their disturbing corporeal critique. However, he erred in ascribing such stereotypes to

---

Withers, *The Illustrated Old English Hexateuch, Cotton Claudius B.iv: the Frontier of Seeing and Reading in Anglo-Saxon England*, Studies in Book and Print Culture (Toronto, 2007).

[4] Andrew P. Scheil, *The Footsteps of Israel: Understanding Jews in Anglo-Saxon England* (Ann Arbor, 2004), pp. 240–53.

[5] Scheil, *The Footsteps of Israel*, p. 253.

[6] Ibid., p. 241.

an exclusively late medieval worldview. As I will demonstrate, the ideas about Jews and Jewish practice expressed in Vercelli VII are representative of a particular strain of anti-Judaism that was invented, or at the very least nurtured, by John Chrysostom in fourth-century Antioch and Constantinople, and adopted or adapted by admirers and translators of his work through the Middle Ages. As I have established elsewhere, the ultimate source for Vercelli VII is a late fourth-century homily composed by John Chrysostom on the Pseudo-Pauline Epistle to the Hebrews (his homily 29 *In epistulam ad Hebraeos*).[7] Mutianus Scholasticus translated Chrysostom's homily into Latin in the sixth century, as part of a commission by Cassiodorus to translate all thirty-four of Chrysostom's homilies on Hebrews for the use of his monks at Vivarium.[8] Mutianus's Latin translation became the principal vehicle for the circulation of Chrysostom's Homilies on Hebrews in the West.[9] Although it is

---

[7] Samantha Zacher, "The Source of Vercelli VII: An Address to Women," in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, TASS 4 (Toronto, 2009), pp. 98–149. Chrysostom's homily (henceforth referred to as "homily 29") is printed by Migne in PG 63:203–8; Mutianus's Latin translation is printed in PG 63:419–26. See further the English translation of Chrysostom's *Epistle to the Hebrews, no.* XXIX, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 9, trans. Philip Schaff (NewYork, 1890), pp. 499–502. For a superior edition of the Greek texts, see *Sancti Patris Nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Interpretatio Omnium Epistolarum Paulinarum per Homilias Facta,* ed. Frederick Field, 7 vols. (Oxford, 1845–1862), vol. 7. For a scholarly edition of Vercelli VII, see *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, ed. D. G. Scragg, EETS o.s. 300 (Oxford, 1992), pp. 133–38; an emended edition together with the Latin translation by Mutianus is in Zacher "The Source of Vercelli VII," pp. 150–63.

[8] Hermann Josef Frede attributes the Latin translation to Mutianus Scholasticus in his authoritative *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel*, 4th ed., Vetus Latina 1/1 (Freiburg, 1995), p. 646, and Frede's opinion is accepted in all supplements to his work, down to the most recent, by Roger Gryson, in *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel. Aktualisierungsheft 2004*, Vetus Latina 1/1D (Freiburg, 2004).

[9] Ibid; also see the PhD dissertation of Ingrid Wilhelmsson "Studien zu Mutianus dem Chrysostomosübersetzer" (Lund, 1944).

still unknown precisely how or when the Latin translation reached Anglo-Saxon England (since no manuscripts containing the complete translation have survived from the period), it was available in England by the second half of the eighth century at the latest, since Alcuin's ambitious commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews relied heavily upon Mutianus's translation.[10]

My earlier work on Vercelli VII established the philological connections between the Old English homily and its source texts, and classified various changes, omissions, and additions made by the homilist to them.[11] It also supplied new context for the homilist's address to women, and his chastisement of "feminine" soft living, avoidance of labour, and excessive use of cosmetics and luxuries as behaviours that can be seen to engender moral and physical turpitude. As I demonstrated, these attitudes and images were borrowed comprehensively from Mutianus's translation of Chrysostom, and updated for the Anglo-Saxon homilist's own contemporary audience. Breaking with the conventional view that the Vercelli Book was intended for a predominantly male readership of monks or secular clergy, my discovery lent support to Mary Dockray-Miller's hypothesis that there was an active female readership for the Vercelli Book in Anglo-Saxon England.[12]

In the present essay, I return to Vercelli VII and its sources to explore how the homilist's classification of Jews as similarly soft, effeminate, gluttonous, profligate, and idolatrous participants in the same rhetorical matrix that castigates overindulgent and idle

[10] See Michael Fox, "Alcuin's *Expositio in epistolam ad Hebraeos*," *JML* 18 (2008), 326–45. For the knowledge of Chrysostom's work in Anglo-Saxon England, see Thomas N. Hall, "John Chrysostom," in *Sources of Old English and Anglo-Latin Literary Culture* [SOEALLC], posted at https://github.com/SOEALLC/. Accessed 2019 July 30.

[11] For a full comparative analysis, see Zacher, "The Source of Vercelli VII."

[12] Mary Dockray-Miller "Female Devotion and the Vercelli Book," *PQ* 83 (2004), 337–54.

women in the homily. Using Thomas Laqueur's still influential (though repeatedly qualified) "one-sex" model of the body in Antiquity and the Middle Ages, I examine how Chrysostom (and his translators) strategically affixed the designations "Christian" and "Jew" to the relative constructs "masculine" and "feminine," in order to generate a parallel sliding scale of identification.[13] If the classical period exalted the masculine, Greek/Roman, elite, and temperate body, by the fourth century these hierarchies had been reworked to privilege a different type of masculinity oriented toward Christian humility, poverty, and asceticism.[14] Operating within this framework, Chrysostom represented the typical Jewish body as the new antithesis of the Christian body ideal. Chrysostom's charge that Jewish men tended toward characteristically "feminine" proclivities was to diagnosis Jews as constitutionally "too moist" and "too hot," and to associate their "unnatural" states with humoral imbalance, illness, and madness.

It is therefore all the more striking that Vercelli VII repeats and reifies these attitudes towards women and Jews, given that the Old English text was composed far from Chrysostom's Antioch and Constantinople, and indeed in a land without Jews.[15] Presumably, Chrysostom's rhetorical matrix continued to generate meaningful categories of difference in Anglo-Saxon England.[16] It would seem that by the tenth century, the terms "Jew" and

---

[13] Thomas Walter Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, Mass., 1990). For important challenges, revisions, and refinements to the "one-sex" model by subsequent scholars see my note below, p. 000, n.000.

[14] Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven, 1995).

[15] On the status of Jews in pre-conquest medieval England, see Scheil, *The Footsteps of Israel*; and Zacher, ed., *Imagining the Jew*.

[16] Much scholarly work has been dedicated to the transmission and afterlife of John Chrysostom's anti-Judaic works and ideas. Important studies include F. H. Chase, *Chrysostom: A Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation* (Cambridge, 1887); Robert Louis Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in*

"Judaizer" had accrued symbolic meaning well beyond their original Chrysostomian contexts, to serve as a "catch-all idiom" for spiritual reprobates who, like the Jews, misread Scripture and adhered to its tenets in an overly "fleshly" and "literal" manner. The new medieval "Judaizers" still categorically included Jews, but now expanded to include heathens, schismatics, heretics, sinners, and all those who would willfully turn away from Christian salvation.[17]

As such, Vercelli VII and its antecedents trouble and complicate what has become the "standard" narrative of the development of Antisemitism in the Middle Ages.[18] This account,

---

the Late 4th Century (Berkeley, 1983); Stanislav Doležal, "Possible Legal Impact of the Homilies against the Jews by Joannes Chrysostomos," *Graecolatina Pragensia* 23 (2010), 15–29; Wendy Mayer, "Preaching Hatred? John Chrysostom, Neuroscience, and the Jews," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, ed. Chris L. De Wet and Wendy Mayer, Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1 (Leiden, 2019), pp. 1–31; and Michael G. Azar, *Exegeting the Jews: The Early Reception of the Johannine Jews*, Bible in Ancient Christianity 10 (Leiden, 2016), pp. 101–42.

[17] Hence, Ælfric and Wulfstan frequently and casually conflate the designations "heathen" and "Jew." See the influential article by George Younge, "The New Heathens: Anti-Jewish Hostility in Early English Literature," in *Writing Europe, 500–1450: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Aidan Conti, Orietta Da Rold, and Philip Shaw, Essays and Studies 68 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2015), pp. 123–46 (my many thanks to Stewart Brookes for pointing me to this article). For the specific conflation of Jewishness and heresy in the late Middle Ages, see, Jeffrey Jerome Cohen's blog "Was Margery Kempe Jewish?" *In the Middle*, posting for Friday, April 21, 2006, and his earlier "The Becoming Liquid of Margery Kempe," in *Medieval Identity Machines*, Medieval Cultures 35 (Minneapolis, 2003), pp. 154–87. On the "Jewish" qualities of heretics, see Norman Roth, "Jews and Albigensians, in the Middle Ages: Lucas of Tuy on Heretics in Leon," *Sefarad* 41 (1981), 71–93; and R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250*, 2nd ed. (Malden, MA, 2007).

[18] For a cogent and informative critique of this "standard" narrative, see David Nirenberg, *Anti-Judaism: The Western Tradition* (New York, 2013). A fuller assessment of the ways in which Chrysostom's writings and translations trouble periodization can be found in my current book project, *The Fear of Becoming Jewish: Conceptions of Contagion, Corruption, and Containment in Premodern Literature and Culture*. The monograph

promoted by Gavin Langmuir in his influential *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, and repeated in even the most recent Jewish intellectual histories, is that the early "anti-Judaic" rhetoric of the kind witnessed in the patristic and early medieval periods differed fundamentally both in degree and kind from the forms of "anti-Semitism" that arose in the course of the twelfth century and beyond.[19] Robert C. Stacey summarizes these differences elegantly, and accepts the general conclusion:

> The twelfth century saw the rise of new *fantastical* fictions about Jewish belief, practice, and bodies. These "anti-Semitisms" differed markedly from earlier forms of anti-Judaic rhetoric, which had been so ubiquitous in the writings of the Church fathers, and which *exerted xenophobic hostility grounded in differences between systems of belief*. Such older views typically implicated Jews as the killers of Christ; as willful dissenters from the true faith; as blind servants of the flesh; and in its most aggressive expression as conspirators who sought to destroy Christendom. By contrast, the new anti-Semitisms accused Jews of killing Christian children in the forms of ritual murder (first in the form of crucifixion, and then later blood libels), and

---

investigates on a much broader scale the early development of stereotypes pertaining to Jewish sickness and contagion, and provides a deeper examination of the political and social pressures that framed Chrysostom's homilies on Jews, tracing their intersection with theological debates from the early Church to the sixteenth century.

[19] On the supposed difference between the categories "anti-Judaism" and "anti-Semitism" see Gavin I. Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkeley, 1996), especially the introduction and chaps. 9–12. Geraldine Heng's *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages* (New York, 2018) provides an excellent account of how racializing discourse was applied to Jews. However, this study also takes the twelfth century as the definitive starting point for the development of this rhetoric.

> imputed to them charges of willful and vengeful desecration of the Host (emphasis mine).[20]

The deeply somatic anti-Jewish rhetoric of Vercelli VII and its Greek and Latin antecedents does not conform easily to this timeline. These homilies have very little to say about "differences between systems of belief," and a great deal to offer in the way of "fantastical fictions about Jewish belief, practice, and bodies." The logic of "Jewish contagion" grounded in a concept of the corruption and corruptibility of the Jewish body—present in both Chrysostom's homily and the Vercelli VII translation—demonstrates the presence of an already systematized discourse about Jewish bodies, extant as early as the fourth century in Antioch and Constantinople. Vercelli VII therefore stands as an important witness to the endurance of a highly specific strain of an early somatic anti-Judaism that was transmitted to, and reified in, early medieval England.[21]

L2 Chrysostom Against Jews and Judaizers

Intellectual historians of the early Church have argued that Chrysostom's notoriously vehement invective against Jews and Jewish practice emanated chiefly from his desire to establish clear and totalizing boundaries between Christian and Jewish practice and observance in a time of intense cultural hybridity.[22] Chrysostom lived in Antioch in a period

---

[20] Robert C. Stacey, "Anti-Semitism and the Medieval English State," in *The Medieval State: Essays Presented to James Campbell*, ed. John Maddicott and D. M. Palliser (London, 2000), p. 164.

[21] Scheil's astute analysis of Vercelli VII provides an important starting ground for destabilizing these epochal claims.

[22] See especially Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews*; Susanna Drake, *Slandering the Jew: Sexuality and Difference in Early Christian Texts*, Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion (Philadelphia, 2013); Isabella Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews, and Christians in Antioch*, Greek Culture in the

when Jews and Christians lived in close quarters, and had generally good relations—too good, in fact, for Chrysostom.[23] His homilies raged about the problem of professed Christians who continued to attend synagogue, celebrated Jewish high holidays and festivals, and even kept the Jewish Sabbath. Yet following Wilken's hypothesis, it is now generally accepted that Chrysostom's most virulent homilies about Jews—his eight sermons written *Adversus Iudaeos*, which he composed and preached in Antioch early in his career (ca. AD 378)—were in fact mostly aimed at Judaizing Christians who refused to stop their observance of Jewish holidays and rituals.[24] Recent scholarship has therefore taken the position that Chrysostom's most vitriolic statements about Jews should be understood chiefly as a platform for rendering Judaism unattractive to his own Christian flock, and as a stimulus for catalysing Christian reform. In such scholarly accounts, Chrysostom's virulent anti-Judaism is softened to a

---

Roman World (Cambridge, 2007). Also see the excellent introduction by Paul W. Harkins, in his translation of John Chrysostom's *Discourses against Judaizing Christians* (Washington, D.C., 1979). All translations of this work are from Harkins.

[23] Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews.* On the dynamic of religious and cultural hybridity in the early Church period, see Daniel Boyarin and Virginia Burrus, "Hybridity as Subversion of Orthodoxy? Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity," *Social Compass* 52 (2005), 431–41.

[24] It is instructive that the now standard English translation of Chrysostom's homilies by Harkins uses the title *Homilies Against Judaizing Christians*, instead of the traditional title *Kata Iuodaiōn* (in Greek), and *adversus Iudaeos* (in Latin). See Harkins's introduction in *Discourses Against Judaizing Christians.* On the problem of Judaizing in the early Church, see especially David Nirenberg, "Discourses of Judaizing and Judaism in Medieval Spain," *La corónica: A Journal of Medieval Hispanic Languages, Literatures, and Cultures* 41 (2012), 207–33; Michele Murray, *Playing a Jewish Game: Gentile Christian Judaizing in the First and Second Centuries CE* (Ontario, 2004), esp. pp. 3–4; Dayna S. Kalleres, *City of Demons: Violence, Ritual, and Christian Power in Late Antiquity* (Oakland, 2015)*;* Christine Shepardson, "Controlling Contested Places: John Chrysostom's *Adversus Iudaeos* Homilies and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15 (2007), 483–516; and Mayer "Preaching Hatred?"

"mere" tool for Christian self-critique, rather than an instantiation of outright anti-Jewish hatred.[25] Chrysostom's exaggerated portraits of Jewish perversion and profligacy, pushed to the point of caricature, lends some credibility to this theory—his homilies succeed in painting a picture of Judaism that is unappealing, if not demonic. However, as my analysis of Chrysostom's medical tropes will also demonstrate, Jews remained prominent and omnipotent targets of Chrysostom's somatic critique to the extent that he imagined them to be the original agents of disease and corruption. For Chrysostom and others following him, the Jewish catalysts of depravity and corruption never simply faded harmlessly into the background.

Chrysostom's anxiety about Jewish influence was deeply rooted in his concerns about the instability and future of a still fledgling Christian Church. Although Constantine's conversion had by Chrysostom's time made Christianity the official religion of the Empire, it was by no means obvious to Christians living in that era that the Church would continue its ascent to majority status.[26] As Wilken has pointed out, Chrysostom lived through the turbulent era of Julian the Apostate, who (in 363 A.D.) not only instituted legislation against Christian practice, education, and worship, and wrote anti-Christian treatises, but who also attempted to rebuild the Jewish Temple as a means of disproving Christianity's claims to supersession.[27] Matthew's Gospel (24:1–2) had predicted the destruction of the Temple as a definitive sign of Jesus's true ministry, and of the permanent diasporization of the Jews. Had Julian's plans been successful, many Christians would have interpreted the rebuilding of the

---

[25] Wilken strenuously promotes this position in his *John Chrysostom and the Jews.* See also C. Fonrobert, "Jewish Christians, Judaizers, and anti-Judaism," in *Late Ancient Christianity*, ed. Virginia Burrus, A People's History of Christianity 2 (Minneapolis, 2005), pp. 234–54. For a more flexible view of "Judaizing" that still includes Jews, see Mayer "Preaching Hatred?"; and Kalleres, *City of Demons.*

[26] Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews,* p. 129.

[27] Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews,* pp. 128–29.

Temple as a sign that Christian supersession was erroneous and ungodly.[28] These anxieties drove and intensified Chrysostom's anti-Judaic rhetoric, since he viewed the problem of Jewish practice by Christians within the church as the chief obstacle to unity within the Church itself.

Such apprehensions about the future of Christianity are reflected everywhere in Chrysostom's discussions of Jews and Jewish practice. Thus, in his eight homilies written *Adversos Iudaeos*, he repeatedly describes the Synagogue as a brothel and a theatre (1.2.7; 1.3.1; 4.7.3) and its members as whores and profligates.[29] Chrysostom writes: "but these Jews are gathering choruses of effeminates and a great rubbish heap of harlots; they drag into the synagogue the whole theater, actors and all. For there is no difference between the theater and the synagogue" (1.2.7).[30] The charge of depraved sexuality and effeminacy forms the core of his anti-Judaic critique in the majority of these writings.[31] In several texts, he compares Jews to beasts who cannot control their desires and sexual urges. He argues that although the Jews were the formerly chosen people of God, they became like pigs and goats "who are bent only on filling their bellies, getting drunk and chasing after dancers and charioteers" (1.4.1)[32] or like dogs, untamed calves, and amorous stallions who cannot control their carnal and sexual appetites.[33]

---

[28] See Jacob Marcus*, The Jew in the Medieval World: A Sourcebook, 315–1791* (New York, 1938; repr. 1978), pp. 8–12.

[29] Harkins, trans., *Discourses Against Judaizing Christians,* p. xl n. 82.

[30] Harkins, trans., *Discourses Against Judaizing Christians*, p. 9.

[31] Drake, "'A Synagogue of *Malakoi* and *Pornai*': John Chrysostom's *Sermons Against the Jews*," in *Slandering the Jew,* pp. 78–98.

[32] Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews*, pp. xxxviii– xxxix n. 76.

[33] See Drake, *Slandering the Jew,* pp. 78–98.

Chrysostom used carefully chosen medical language in order to depict the Jews of his day as agents of disease, capable of infecting and polluting their Christian neighbours. The possibility of corruption was especially acute for "weak" Christian "Judaizers," who erroneously kept Jewish customs and attended synagogue. In the first of his homilies *Adversus Iudaeos*, he wrote that

> A very serious illness calls for any cure my words can bring, an illness which has become implanted in the body of the church. We must first root this ailment out and then take thought for matters outside; we must first cure our own and then be concerned for others who are strangers. What is this disease? The festivals of the pitiful and miserable Jews… (1.1.4–5).[34]

Chrysostom's medical figure highlights a central problem in his thinking about religious difference: the "Jewish disease" of which he writes is not safely quarantined outside the body of the Church, but rather is already "implanted" within it, and precariously close to rendering the fine tissues and members of the Church body necrotic. His rhetoric would seem to permit only one real solution: the removal of society's corrosive agents through purgation or expulsion. Chrysostom, however, understood far too clearly the impossibility of implementing a totalizing remedy. Not only were Christians and Jews in constant contact in their everyday lives, but Christianity at its very roots had always been inextricably and complexly linked to and anchored in Jewish theology, messianism, and ethics.

L2 Chrysostom's New Body Matrix

[34] Harkins, trans., *Discourses Against Judaizing Christians,* p. 3.

Underpinning Chrysostom's representation of "Jewish/Judaizing" sickness, contagion, and effeminacy are the following key assumptions based in medical humoral diagnostics, all of which are repeated and reified by Mutianus and the author of Vercelli VII in their respective translations of homily 29:

1. that "Jewishness" and "femininity" occupy similarly inferior poles because they manifest the same basic tendencies toward "softness," hypersexuality, bodily excess, corporeality, and extravagance;

2. that sickness and disease originate predominantly within the body, and generally as the result of the imbalance of complexions or humours within it;

3. that because all material bodies (human, animal, environmental, and planetary) are comprised of the same basic humoral complexions, imbalance in one body is transferable to other individual, corporate, institutional, and even cosmic bodies;

4. that physical disease is inextricably linked to psychological, moral, and religious imperfection and feebleness, to the extent that humoral imbalance causes and is reflective of sickness and sin;

5. that "Judaizing" in Chrysostom's work represents the transference of "Jewish disease" to Christian bodies and souls; and

6. that health requires the reestablishment of humoral equilibrium with the body and adjacent bodies.

It is possible to trace most of these ideas to ancient and late-antique medical practice and theory. For example, Chrysostom's endogenous conception of sickness and disease corresponds to ancient "humoral theory," especially as it had been refined by Galen and Soranus in the second century A.D..[35] Chrysostom and his translators correspondingly assert

[35] Because of the literary nature of Chrysostom's medical metaphors, and because humoral medicine and theory was so common in Anglo-Saxon England (see p. 000, n. 000 below), it is not possible to trace the homilist's

that all human bodies contain humours and complexions that render them more or less cold/hot, moist/dry, soft/hard.[36] They also follow the Galenic epitome (and Aristotelian "mean") in asserting that a healthful body and soul must maintain temperate equilibrium between these poles. This conflation of psychic and physical phenomena is consistent with the ancient and medieval philosophy of the body in general—even the most rigid Platonic theory expressed what can only be described as a "soft dualism," when compared with the later substantive Cartesian model.[37] As we shall see, this tethering of physical and psychic phenomena played a central role in the categorization of Jewish bodies as being both sick in flesh and mind in Chrysostom's homily and its translations.

Humoral theory also lends important context to the representation of women (in general) and Jewish men (in particular) in all three homilies as "effeminate"—a charge he uses repeatedly to impute moral and physical inferiority and imperfection. Although Chrysostom acknowledged that men and women were born with different reproductive organs and physical attributes, he rejected a strictly "essentialist" understanding of the "sexed body."[38] Rather, he understood masculinity and femininity as occupying poles in a spectrum

---

understanding of disease and humoral medicine to a specific school of thought. For the evidence of humoral medicine in Anglo-Saxon medical and literary texts, see p. 000, n. 000 below.

[36] There are many comprehensive treatments of ancient humoral theory. Of the scholars treated here, see Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, chap. 1, and Holmes, *Gender*, pp. 34–35.

[37] Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, pp. 10–11.

[38] Recent scholarship on early conceptions of the body, sexuality, and gender has stressed the absence of a monolithic conception of how sex and gender were understood and depicted in these eras, and with it, a lack of consensus as to whether ancients presumed these categories to be binding or changeable. This picture is complicated further still by the lack of clear consensus between the medical treatises and literary texts written in the same day and age: neither can unproblematically be used as a gauge of reigning social or medical ideologies. See further Holmes, *Gender*, esp. pp. 14–56.

of possibilities, which included being "more masculine" and "more feminine." Or, to put it more precisely (using language derived from Brooke Holmes's account of the "sexed body" in Aristotle's work), he constructed "the anatomical and physiological differences between men and women [as having] something contingent about them. They belong[ed] to a realm more fluid and accidental than that of essence and principles—namely, the realm of matter."[39] Chrysostom charted humoral and gendered coordinates along the same ideational continuum, representing all bodies (both genders and all ages) as falling "somewhere on a spectrum from moist to dry, cold to hot, soft to hard." Following Galen and others, he classified women and infants as being "moister, colder, and softer than men"; "effeminate (soft, *malakos*) men" were "those whose constitutions (including what we would call both psychological and physiological) are too moist or soft."[40] In all three versions of Chrysostom's homily 29 the charges of "effeminacy," "softness," "wetness," and "porousness" represent stable critiques of Jews, Judaizers, and women.

Chrysostom's treatment of the body in many ways conforms to Thomas Laqueur's influential "one-sex" model for the premodern body. In his *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (1990), Laqueur made the novel argument that premodern philosophy and theory treated the "sexed body" as belonging to a "spectrum in which masculinity occupied one pole, femininity the other."[41] He contrasted this ancient system with the post-eighteenth-century "two-sex" model, which (in his view) was based in a more rigorous binary conception of gender, grounded in biological difference. Laqueur maintained

---

[39] Holmes, *Gender*, p. 43. Galen went to so far as to classify women as "essentially men in whom a lack of vital heat – of perfection – had resulted in the retention, inside, of structures that in the male are visible without." Laqueur, *Making Sex*, p. 4.

[40] Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, p. 29.

[41] This is Martin's paraphrase of Laqueur (*The Corinthian Body*, p. 29).

that in "pre-Enlightenment texts, and even some later ones, *sex*, or the body, must be understood as the epiphenomenon, while *gender,* what we would take to be a cultural category, was primary or 'real.'"[42] Recent gender-theorists have challenged aspects of Laqueur's schema, especially his insistence that the "one-sex" model was the dominant, or even exclusive, paradigm of sexuality in antiquity. Joan Cadden, Monica H. Green, Katherine Park, Brooke Holmes, Helen King, and others have, for example, provided evidence of alternative ancient and literary medical models, which privileged "nature" over "nurture."[43] In the wake of Judith Butler's theory of "gender as performance," one must now view with suspicion any claim that matter and materiality can serve as reliable indicators of "modern" sexual difference.[44] Despite the validity of these challenges, I retain Laqueur's term—"one-

---

[42] Laqueur, *Making Sex*, p. 8.

[43] Joan Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages: Medicine, Science, and Culture*, Cambridge Studies in the History of Medicine (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 1–39; Monica H. Green, "Bodily Essences: Bodies as Categories of Difference," in *A Cultural History of the Human Body, vol. 2: In the Medieval Age*, ed. Linda Kalof (New York, 2010), pp. 149–71; Katharine Park, "Cadden, Laqueur, and the 'One-Sex Body,'" *Medieval Feminist Forum* 46 (2010), 96–100; Brooke Holmes, *Gender: Antiquity and Its Legacy*, Ancients and Moderns (Oxford and New York, 2012), pp. 14–56; and Helen King, *The One-Sex Body on Trial: The Classical and Early Modern Evidence*, History of Medicine in Context (Farnham and Burlington, VT, 2013). Recent scholarship on early conceptions of the body, sexuality, and gender has stressed the absence of a monolithic conception of how sex and gender were understood and depicted in these eras, and with it, a lack of consensus as to whether ancients presumed these categories to be binding or changeable. This picture is complicated further still by the lack of clear consensus between the medical treatises and literary texts written in the same day and age: neither can unproblematically be used as a gauge of reigning social or medical ideologies.

[44] Holmes lucidly articulates the junctures at which Laqueur and Butler part company. She writes that "where Butler diverges from these scholars [i.e. Laqueur and Schiebinger] is in her understanding of matter, or rather, the material body as stable, unquestioned ground of sexual difference. For Laqueur and others, working primarily in ancient medicine and biology, the ancients see the body as too fluid to stabilize sexed

sex" model—in order to represent as economically as possible the concept of the gender-humoral spectrum in Chrysostom's homily and its subsequent Latin and Old English translations without reifying his associated claims about exclusivity or periodization. Especially relevant for analysing all three versions of Chrysostom's homily 29 is Laqueur's assertion that ancient medical "imbalance" theory charted social hierarchies, such as class and elite status, along the same basic ideological continuum. For Chrysostom (like Galen and others before him), the perfect body was the elite body; imperfection was by default associated with the lower-class body.[45] While the hierarchical coordinates of gender and social status allowed a degree of upward mobility, the system as a whole did not permit comprehensive topsy-turvy upheaval. Thus, while female bodies could become more perfect through labour and toil, and through diets and regimens that made them harder, drier, and hotter they could never fully attain the masculine ideal. Although imperfect upper-class bodies could be moulded, regimented, and shaped to bring them closer to the peak humoral and character ideals, lower status bodies could never achieve that epitome.[46]

At the same time, Chrysostom rejected other key aspects of classical body ideology. Dale Martin has argued persuasively that the advent of Christianity catalyzed changes to certain classical core values.[47] In the process of founding the early Jesus ministry, the apostle Paul modified and inverted select features of the elite Greco-Roman body ideology to

---

identities…she finds in the ancient sources – and more specifically in Plato – the looser idea that matter exists prior to cultural markings and significations. Such sources represent, for her, the distant origins of modern commitments to the materiality of sex." Holmes, *Gender*, pp. 70–71.

[45] Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, pp. 29–37.

[46] For in-depth analysis of gendered hierarchies and their relationship to power, see Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, pp. 38–68.

[47] Ibid.

accommodate new ascetic ideals.[48] For Paul, hard work, toil, suffering, and poverty (formerly associated with lower-class bodies) became the highest goals of Christian life and indicators of excellence, while wealth and idleness (formerly upper-class ideals) took their place at the lowest, basest poles. This does not mean that Paul was a practical revolutionary: as Martin has persuasively argued, Paul's most radical egalitarianism was reserved for his utopian "apocalyptic discourse," which was centered on a future time of judgement and resurrection.[49]

I argue that Martin's modified Pauline hierarchical system passed without significant complication to the Church's intellectual elite, once rigid institutional differences between Judaism and Christianity had been established and asserted (i.e. as early as the second century). When it did so, these poles were widened to include and inscribe essentialized "Christian" and "Jewish" bodies, which were distributed along the same basic hierarchical fault lines.[50] I am calling this modified system a "one-sex / one-religion model," because it unites on the same basic spectrum gendered and religious polarities, encoded in a system of powered elitism.[51] The ideal Christian body followed the Pauline masculine ideal, insofar as it modeled sexual temperance, toil and suffering, and rigid control of its bodily functions (including sexual urges and desires). Jewish bodies, on the other hand, came to occupy the

---

[48] Ibid.

[49] Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, pp. 60–65. According to Martin, "the apocalyptic world is not one in which hierarchies are dissolved into equality but one in which the values of the Greco-Roman world are acknowledged but then turned on their heads. The apocalyptic Gospel reveals the instability of the values assumed by Greco-Roman culture, replacing them with a mirror world in which top is bottom and bottom up" (p. 60).

[50] The Christian ascetic ideal did not pose any special challenge or problem to this system, since the Greco-Roman elite idealized continence as well.

[51] This "religious" model also sidesteps important religious differences: there were many types of practising Jews and Christians, including heretics and schismatics. Patristic authors were aware of this, yet they chose repeatedly to lump all Jews into one category.

same lower polarity as the most effeminate and soft female bodies. Jews were thus generally characterized as being sluggish, overindulgent, sickly, passive, and effeminate. This modified system provides an accurate frame for understanding the treatment of the Jewish body as the antithesis of the Christian ascetic ideal, in Chrysostom's homily 29 and in its Latin and Old English translations.

From a strictly medical viewpoint, it should not surprise us that Chrysostom's humoral scheme transferred seamlessly to an Anglo-Saxon context. Galenic humoral theory was transmitted through a series of early English medical treatises, especially the Anglo-Saxon *Herbarium*; *Medicina de Quadrupedibus*; *Peri Didaxeon*, and *Læceboc I and II*).[52] Conan Doyle, moreover, has demonstrated the substantial influence of humoral medical vocabulary in non-medical texts: these include computistical texts that explain elemental and cosmic humoral theory (such as Bede's eighth-century *De temporum ratione*, and Byrhtferth's eleventh-century *Enchiridion*), theological treatises grounded in Latin originals (e.g., the Old English translations of Gregory the Great's *Pastoral Care* and of Boethius's *Consolation of*

[52] For textual evidence of humoral medical analysis and theory in Anglo-Saxon England, see Lois Ayoub "Old English *wæta* and the Medical Theory of the Humours," *JEGP* 94 (1995), 332–46; Conan Doyle, "Anglo-Saxon Medicine and Disease: A Semantic Approach" (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2011); Malcolm Cameron, *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*, CSASE 7 (Cambridge, 1993); Faith Wallis, "Medicine in Medieval Calendar Manuscripts," in *Manuscript Sources of Medieval Medicine: A Book of Essays*, ed. Margaret Rose Schleissner, Garland Medieval Casebooks 8 (London, 1995), pp. 105–43; and Christine Voth, "Bald's Leechbook," in *The Encyclopedia of Medieval Literature in Britain*, ed. Siân Echard and Robert Rouse, Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Literature (Chichester, West Sussex, 2017). Ayoub (p. 341) notes that humoral medicine played a significant part in Old English medical texts that were heavily indebted to Latin originals (i.e., *Herbarium*; *Medicina de Quadrupedibus*; and *Peri Didaxeon*, and in *Læceboc I and II)*, whereas humoral medicine played almost no part in "native" medical treatises, such as that found in *Lacnunga* and the third *Læceboc III.* On disease etiologies in Anglo-Saxon England see also Claire L. Whitenack, "Poison and Disease in Anglo-Saxon Medicine and Metaphor" (PhD diss., Cornell University, 2019).

Philosophy); and homilies (including anonymous materials in the Vercelli Book and pervasively in Ælfric's sermons), to explain and warn about bodily and environmental imbalances and complexions that lead to sin and corruption.[53]

My analysis therefore demonstrates that in all three texts, the assumption remained that both women and Jews could improve their bodily conditions and character *to a degree* by imitating the practices and behaviours associated with the male Christian ideal. For Jews (as for women), the corrective paradigm required increased toil; temperance with regard to sex and food; moderation, together with humoral modifications that could result in increased "masculinization"; and self-containment [54] Yet, while this theoretical system did not permit women to actually *become* men, Jews were allowed, and even encouraged, to convert.[55] By becoming Christian, Jews were, at least in theory, set on a course toward bodily perfection,

---

[53] See Doyle, "Anglo-Saxon Medicine and Disease," and his Table 5.6 of humoral influence in non-medical Anglo-Saxon texts, pp. 175–78. For the influence of Soranus in Anglo-Saxon texts, see pp. 68–69.

[54] There are some significant exceptions to this rule. There are many hagiographic tales of female saints who dressed and passed as men their whole lives, and some of them (Saint Eugenia, for example) even became abbots of monasteries. For examples and discussion, see for example, Valerie R. Hotchkiss, *Clothes Make the Man: Female Cross Dressing in Medieval Europe*, New Middle Ages 1 (New York, 1996); the special issue of Dorothy Kim and M. W Bychowski, "Visions of Medieval Trans Feminism," in *Medieval Feminist Forum* 55 (2019); Virginia Burrus, *"Begotten, Not Made": Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity* , Figurae: Reading Material Culture (Stanford, 2000). On the famous case of John/Eleanor Rykener, see David Lorenzo Boyd and Ruth Mazo Karras, "The Interrogation of a Male Transvestite Prostitute in Fourteenth Century London," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 1 (1995), 459–65. I am grateful to the volume's anonymous reader for some of these bibliographic suggestions.

[55] Stacy Klein has written about the inability of powerful women to become fully masculine in her essay "Gender," in *A Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Studies*, ed. Jacqueline A. Stodnick and Renée Rebecca Trilling, Cultural Theory Handbooks (Chichester, West Sussex, 2012), pp. 39–54. Klein's work on the Old English *Judith* is particularly pertinent as it explores conjunctions between gender and Jewishness.

precisely because of their bodily sameness. This contradiction regarding the uneven status of Jews and women passes without explicit comment in Chrysostom's *oeuvre*, even though it underpins his anxieties about both bodies everywhere. The new "Jewish/ Judaizing" disease in Chrysostom's homilies reflects a new pathological fear of Jewish influence and of Christian backsliding.[56] Chrysostom's radical religion-body matrix made it possible to assert, with medical authority to back it up, that Christians who engaged in so-called "Jewish" behaviours—gluttony, lechery, idolatry—actually became somatically wetter, softer, more effeminate, and spiritually sicker. This new pathology revealed that Christians were in constant danger *of becoming (like) Jews*; only restraint and adherence to the true ascetic Christian ideal could be curative.

L2 The Corruptible Body

As we turn explicitly to the analysis of Vercelli VII and Chrysostom's homily 29 via Mutianus's translation we can see the extent to which this modified "one-sex/ one-religion" model, with all of its complications and contradictions, is operative. In these homilies, humoral terminology, and the issue of sickly imbalance, dominates as a means of communicating the precarity of health in all human bodies and souls. The limits of the spectrum come to the fore most clearly in the discussions of women and Jews.

Before addressing these more extraordinary examples, it is vital first to establish how Chrysostom and his translators treated the idealized male Christian body when it was compromised by overindulgence and intemperance, and when it was corrected through abstinence and moderation. The following passage describes in graphic detail what happens to

[56] This fear of slippage between religious identities actually manifested itself in a variety of pathologies. Jonathan Boyarin has demonstrated that for Christians there was an ever-present fear that the conversion of Jews might not stick, and that back-sliding into Jewishness could occur. See his *The Unconverted Self: Jews, Indians, and the Identity of Christian Europe* (Chicago, 2009).

the body of the male glutton once insatiable desire has set in (I quote the Latin text here because it is more detailed than the Old English):

> Huc accedit quia uoluptas illa, usquequo linguam uel gulam tangit, apparet; cum autem mensa remota fuerit, uel postquam erit cibus assumptus, similis eris ei qui nihil illius attigerit: magis autem, multoque amplius peiorem grauedinem ex illis cibis et distentionem et opressionem mentis habiturus atque somnum morti consimilem; forenses etiam iuges habebis uigilias propter stomachi cruditatem et praeclusionem spiritus interioris, et per molestiam ructationis indigestae, et plurimum maledicturus es tuum uentrem, cum deberes magis intemperantiae uitium atque immoderationis arguere. Non itaque deliciemur deliciis corporis, sed audiamus Paulum dicentem: Carnis curam ne perficiatis in concupiscentiis. [Rom. 13:14] (Z. 50)[57]

> It has come to this point [when pleasure causes annoyance] because pleasure is apparent [only] in so far as [the food] touches the tongue and the throat; but when the table is taken away, or after the food has been consumed, you will be like a man who has touched none of it: or worse yet, as one about to have far worse heaviness from that food, and swelling and oppression of the mind, and a sleep very like death; you will have public and indeed continual restlessness on account of the indigestion of the stomach and obstruction of the inner spirit and through the annoyance of undigested belching, and you will curse most of all your belly, when you should rather blame the vice of intemperance and immoderation. Let us not therefore be delighted by the

[57] Here and throughout, passages from Vercelli VII are cited by line numbers in *The Vercelli Homilies*, ed. Scragg (S.), and by chart numbers in Zacher, "The Source of Vercelli VII" (Z.). Passages in Mutianus's Latin homily are cited by chart number in Zacher, "The Source of Vercelli VII." Translations are from my edition, although some have been updated here.

> delights of the body, but let us hear Paul saying: make not provision for the flesh in its desires.

Chrysostom's description of the excessive body is clearly indebted to Galenic humoral theory.[58] The Latin makes clear the idea that the glutton's problem is behavioural, not inherently biological: overindulgence and intemperance cause psychic and physiological imbalance and corruption. The glutton therefore experiences cruel "distention and oppression" both of the body and the mind, because blockage in the body catalyzes "obstruction of the inner spirit" (praeclusionem spiritus interioris). This spread of corruption and vice (vitium) from body to mind/soul mimics the language of contagion and sin available through the Pauline model.

In all three homilies, the consequences of such behaviour are drastic. In Vercelli VII, the gluttonous body is compared to a dung pit (*feltungrepe*) or toilet ([Lat.] *cloaca*) that is filled with excrement:

> Wyrse is þæt mon ðæs ofer riht bruce þonne hine mon on feltungrepe wiorpe. On þære grepe he wiorðeð to meoxe. Butan tweon, þæs lichoman sceaða on þære wambe he wiorðeð to þam ilcan, and eac ðam licho[ma]n to mettry[m]nesse. Eal þæt man ofer riht þygeð mid unyðnesse, hit him mon sceal framadon (S. 88–92; Z. 52–55).
>
> It is worse to enjoy [food] wrongfully than to cast it into a dung pit. In the pit it will turn to dung. Without a doubt, the enemy of the body [i.e. food eaten immoderately]

[58] For parallel examples of the gluttonous sick body in Galen's writing, see Mark Grant, ed. and trans., *Galen, on Food and Diet* (London, 2000), esp. pp. 19–20.

> will turn into the same in the belly, and also cause the weakening of the body. Everything that is taken wrongfully and uneasily must be put away [from the body].

Excessive eating—not food *per se*—makes the body sick and wasteful.[59] The cure proposed is that all potentially harmful agents should be expelled or driven away, or even cut off from the body. In fact, all three senses obtain in the verb "framadon."[60] The language of exclusion and excision mimics the language that is used elsewhere for Jews and Judaizers, who are to be driven away and excised from the body of the Church as abjected waste. But in the process, this analogy produces an important paradox: if Jews and Christians are coded on a single continuum within the "one-sex/ one-religion" model, how can Jews in any sense be "outside" of the communal body? Chrysostom is clearly aware of this problem, but chooses not to engage with it head on. This, I note, is a typical manoeuvre among Christian exegetes engaged in anti-Jewish commentary.

In Vercelli VII, the language of expulsion is supplemented by prescriptions concerning humoral balance, brought about by temperate living. The Vercelli VII homilist states: "feed your body in moderation, and abandon gluttony. Nor should one eat more than the stomach can digest" (Fedað iowre lichoman on riht 7 forlætað þa oferfylle. Ne sceal man swiðor etan þonne se maga gemyltan mæge; S. 94–95; Z. 57). It is taught that purposeful and temperate consumption "both feeds the body and gladdens the mind toward each healthy thing, and puts to flight each weakness, both in the stomach and in the mind. It helps that the

---

[59] In a limited sense, the type of food also plays a role in this. The Vercelli VII homilist discusses the problem of eating *delicacies* (*swetmetas*). This specification moves "sweetmeats" into the class of luxury.

[60] The *DOE* entry for *framadon* lists the following definitions: 1. "framadon (*fram*), in element-by-element glosses of *amovere* / *removere* / *repellere* 'to take / drive away, remove (something from someone dat.)'"; and 2. "in partial loan-translation gloss of *abscidere* 'to cut off (something),' where, as in sense 1, both *fram*- and *ā*- gloss *abs*-."

food which the stomach tastes is quickly and well digested" (ge þone lichoman fedeð ge þæt mod gladað to ælcere hælo, 7 ælce untrymnesse he flymeð ægðer ge ðam innoðe ge ðam mode. Helpeð þæt se mete hreðe 7 wel mylteð þe se [maga] ðygeð; S. 95–97; Z. 59). In the end, restrained living and eating corrects imbalances, and sends the formerly weak, diseased, sluggish body on its rightful course toward healthy, happy, and disease-free living.

This portrait of the generic male body in a state of self-induced sickness provides a template against which we might measure the treatment of the inherently "less perfect" bodies of women and Jews. In a particularly florid passage, the Vercelli homilist (following Mutianus and Chrysostom closely) addresses the corrupt lifestyles of privileged women who are made weak by extravagant and luxurious behaviours:[61]

> Witodlice ægðer ge hnesce hrægl ge gehwylce hnescnesse þysse worulde no þæt an þa unfæstrædan ac eac þa fæstrædan 7 þæra soðfæstra sawla gewemmeð. For hwon wene ge þæt wif swa sioce syn of hyra gecynde? Ac hit <n>is swa: of hira liðan life hie bioð swa tyddre, for þan þe hie symle inne bioð 7 noht hefies ne wyrceaþ 7 hie oft baðiað 7 mid wyrtgemangum smyriað 7 symle on hnescum beddum hy r[e]stað. Eac ðu meaht þe bet ongytan þæt ic þe soð secge gif ðu genimst on hwylcum orcearde 7 on windigre stowe hwylc treow 7 hyt asettest on hleowfæste stowe 7 on wæterige stowe. ðonne meaht ðu gesion þæt hit sona forleoseð þa fægernesse þe hit hæfde on his agenre stowe. Þenc eac be ðam wifum þe cyrliscu wiorc 7 hefegu on symbel wyrceaþ. Þonne

[61] Elsewhere in the Vercelli Book we find similar critiques of extravagance and riches. Thus, a similar sumptuary critique appears in Vercelli X where overindulgence is linked to moral and spiritual turpitude and a way of life that generally opposes the divine. For more on this theme, see the essay by Robert K. Upchurch in this volume.

> cnawest ðu þæt hie bioð halran 7 cafran þonne þa weras þe on idelnesse lifiað (S. 53–66; Z. 29–35).
>
> Certainly both soft clothing and every soft pleasure of this world harm not the fickle ones alone, but also those who are constant and the souls of the righteous. Why do you expect that women are so sick as a result of their sex?[62] But it is <not> so:[63] they are so weak on account of their soft lifestyles: because they are always indoors, and they do not perform heavy work, and they bathe frequently, and smear themselves with oils, and they always lie on soft beds. Also, you might understand better that I am telling you the truth if you take a certain tree in a certain orchard and in a windy place, and you set it in a sheltered and wet place. Then you might see that it immediately loses the beauty that it had in its own place. Think also about the women who always perform churlish and heavy work. Then you may know that they are healthier and stronger than those men who live in idleness.

This debasement of luxury and excessive bodily care reflects the Christian ascetic ideal. Chrysostom cycles back to this theme repeatedly in his homilies on Hebrews.[64] In homily 28, for example, he professes that ostentatious apparel is best suited for harlots on the stage who want to draw the male gaze. For godly women, beauty is to be sought through virtue alone.[65]

---

[62] The term *gecynde* requires some explanation. The term correlates to Mutianus's phrase *ex conditione sexus*.

[63] For this emendation, see Zacher, "The Source of Vercelli VII."

[64] Chrysostom's homilies on Hebrews were intended to be read or experienced in sequence. Chrysostom makes "insider" references throughout the collection, which rely upon information or themes relayed earlier in the cycle.

[65] It has been speculated that Chrysostom's attacks on the behaviour and dress of noble women may have coincided with (or at least been exacerbated by) conflicts he had with the Empress Eudoxia. During his times as

Given his frequent association of harlotry and prostitution with the Synagogue, we can see the full extent to which his discourses on women and Jews bleed into one another. In Vercelli VII, the extended simile comparing soft women to overtended, overprotected, and overwatered trees follows this logic, and even utilizes the standard Galenic humoral antinomies: women who are exposed to soft, wet, and overly protected environments, are made more cold / wet / soft, and therefore indolent, weak, and ultimately less beautiful. Their characterization as "soft" (Greek *malakos*) covers a multitude of sins. As Martin has explained, "*malakos* can refer to many things: the softness of expensive clothes, the richness and delicacy of gourmet food, the gentleness of light winds and breezes. When used as a term of moral condemnation, the word still refers to something perceived as "soft": laziness, degeneracy, decadence, lack of courage, or, to sum up all these vices in one ancient category: the feminine."[66] Every one of these extended meanings appears in Vercelli VII: the homilist compares soft bodies to overtended plants, overripe wormy fruit, and fetid dung piles. In the case of women, there is room for improvement: they are able to improve their weak condition through "churlish" (*cyrliscu*) hard labour. In some cases, they are able "to surpass idle men." It is clear, however, that even the strongest and most virtuous Christian women are coded lower in Chrysostom's hierarchy than righteous Christian males.

---

bishop of Constantinople (398–404 A.D.), Chrysostom faced several political scandals. As Thomas N. Hall summarizes, Empress Eudoxia "turned many at court and in the church against him, and he was deposed in 403 at the Synod of the Oak on twenty-nine falsified charges contrived by his enemies. The Emperor Arkadios banished John, then recalled him the very next day when he realized the extent of John's popular support. After another public skirmish with Eudoxia, however, John was banished a second time, and he died in 407 while in exile." See Thomas N. Hall, "John Chrysostom."

[66] Dale B. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville, Ky., 2006), p. 44. See also Drake, *Slandering the Jew*, pp. 78–98.

In another passage, the homilist employs the same beauty/ugliness polarities to show that the smearing of oils, frequent bathing, and indulgence does not increase health or beauty, but rather ensures its opposite; sickness and ugliness: "If, however, you [women] follow [the body's] lust, it may not keep either its strength or its beauty, but it will always be sick and unhappy" (Gif ðu þonne his lustum symle fulgæst, þonne ne mæg he nawðer ne his mægen ne his fægernysse [gehealdan], ac symle bið sioc 7 unrot; S. 76–8; Z. 45). Here again, the debasement of external beauty and wealth echoes Paul's reformed body ideologies, rather than upper-class Greco-Roman aesthetic ideals.

L2 The Jewish Body

Finally, we are in a position to analyse the unique status of the Jewish body within this "one-sex / one-religion" matrix. Vercelli VII contains two long passages that discuss the status of Jews and men in the Old Testament. In the first instance, the homilist enumerates a series of men who "were honored on account of their trials and teaching" (þurh geswinc 7 þurh lare hie wurdon geweorðode). The list (which Chrysostom adapts and alters from Hebrews chapter 11) includes Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, David, Elijah, Samuel, and "all the holy prophets." According to the Old English homilist (who follows Chrysostom via Mutianus), these men "were made famous by means of their toil" (wæron þurh geswinc gebyrhte; S. 22–4; Z. 12). The catalogue introduces one of the main themes of the homily: toil and trial (meaning both "suffering" and "affliction") constitute the chief means of combatting sin as well as and bodily and spiritual corruption. The framework of the "one-sex / one-religion" matrix aligns this emphasis on "toil" firmly with the Christian body ideal. Reflecting on these "active" men in the Old Testament, the homilist (again following his sources) poses the following question to his audience: "Indeed, do you expect that through idleness you might come to the brightness which God's chosen earned through toil? Without a doubt you are not able if you want to" (Hwæt, wene ge þæt ge mægen þurh idelnesse

becuman to ðære biorhtnesse þe Godes þa gecorenan mid geswince geearnodon? Butan twion ge <ne> magon gif ge willað; S. 25–7; Z. 13). The audience is instructed to learn from these positive Old Testament exemplars.

Significantly, in all three homilies, a second catalogue follows containing a list of Old Testament figures who led decadent and wasteful lives, and as a result lost salvation. This list (absent in the Epistle to the Hebrews) is original to Chrysostom, and is translated faithfully by Mutianus and the Vercelli VII author.[67] I quote the entire sequence in the Old English with its often awkward phrasing:

> Gemunað eac þa ðe eall hira lif on þisse worulde on olehtungum lifedon. Geþenceað þonne Ladzarus [7] þone welegan þe her dæghwamlice symlede 7 is ðær nu singallice cwelmed. And gemunað Iudeas þe hira lif eall hyra wambe to forlore forgeafon. Be ðam wæs cweden þæt hyra wamb wære hyra god. Geþenceað eac þara þe in Sodome for hira unalyfedum gewilnungum forwurdon, 7 þara þe on Noes dagum wæron. Witodlice be ðam þe ðam yðan life lyfedon on Sodome hit wæs gecweden ðætte on hlafes fylnesse <a>flow<o>n. Þonne sio fylnes ðæs hlafes unriht wyrceð, hwæt is to cweðanne be ðam mænigfealdum smeamettum? Gemunað hu Esaw his dagas on ehtnesse lædde, 7 hu ða ðe ær in þam ryne Godes bearn wæron þurh ænlicra wifa sceawunga to fyrenlustum gehæfte on helle gehruron. Gemunaþ eac hu þa forwurdon þe mid wodheortnesse willan to wæpnedmannum hæmed sohton, 7 eallra Babilone 7 Egypta cyninga ealle hie swiðe ungesæliglice hira lif geendedon 7 nu syndon on ecum witum. Eac swylce þa ilcan witu syndon gearuwe þam mannum þe nu swylcum lifum lifiað swylce hie lyfedon (S. 34–50; Z. 18–26).

[67] Chrysostom in fact adopted this list of figures from The Epistle to the Hebrews, chapter 11, but revised the context to fit his theme of toil and trial.

> Remember also those who lived all their lives in this world in delights. Consider Lazarus [and] the wealthy man who feasted daily here and who is now continuously afflicted there. And remember the Jews who "gave their bellies over to destruction their whole lives."[68] About them it was said that their belly was their god [Phil. 3:19]. Think also of those who perished in Sodom on account of their unlawful desires, and of those who lived in the days of Noah. Certainly, about those who lived the easy life in Sodom it was said that "they flowed away in the fullness of bread" [Ezek. 16:49]. When the surfeit of bread causes evil, what is to be said about those many delicacies? Remember how Esau spent his days in persecution, and how those sons of God, who earlier were captivated by the sight of beautiful women, fell into Hell?[69] Remember also how they perished, who with desirous frenzy sought sex with men, and all of Babylon, and all the kings of Egypt who ended their lives so unhappily and are now experiencing eternal punishments. Also the same torments are prepared for those men who now live such lives as they had lived.

The logic of the passage is hard to follow, and it is likely that some of these statements are currently in the wrong order, even though this is the sequence attested in Chrysostom's original homily. What is clear, however, is that the logical thread linking all of these examples is gluttony, for this vice is presented as the root of all other sins, including avarice, lust, and apostasy. Using the logic of contagion, we are made to understand that once sin is rooted in

[68] This phrasing is strained, but accurately translates Mutianus's Latin "qui uitam suam uentri donauere perdendam." See below for the full quotation.

[69] As I argue below the ones who "fall into hell" are the Nephilim of Genesis 6:2.

the body, it will breed other transgressions. The following analysis makes sense of the passage's opaquer, and generally misunderstood, allusions.

The list begins with a brief reference to the story of the Rich Man parable from Luke 16:19–31, which censures wealth and luxury. It seems significant that Mutianus's Latin version refers in only the most general terms to the rich man's perdition, while the Old English author, recognizing the catalogue's main theme of overindulgence, has attempted to link Dives's damnation specifically to the sin of gluttony.[70] Picking up on this theme, the next reference in the Old English links Jews in general to greed, idolatry, and profanation. The Vercelli VII homilist exhorts his audience to "remember the Jews 'who gave their bellies to destruction' their whole lives. About them it was said that their belly was their god." The Old English follows the awkward syntax of the Latin in naming "Iudaei qui uitam suam uentri donauere perdendam, quorum deus uenter est; [Phil. 3:19] uel illi qui in eremo otium requirentes perierunt" (Z. 20). As we stated previously, the ultimate source for both passages is Philippians 3:19, in which Paul refers to unnamed "enemies of the cross of Christ; whose end is destruction; whose God is their belly; and whose glory is in their shame; who mind earthly things" (inimicos crucis Christi quorum finis interitus: quorum Deus venter est: et gloria in confusione ipsorum, qui terrena sapient [Vulgate version]). Who are these "enemies of Christ"? Very likely they are Judaizing gentiles within Paul's own mission who have continued to preach the need for circumcision and other Jewish practices.[71] The question

[70] See Jane Roberts, "Consider Lazarus: A Context for Vercelli Homily VII," in *Saints and Scholars: New Perspectives on Anglo-Saxon Literature and Culture in Honour of Hugh Magennis*, ed. Stuart. McWilliams (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 75–86.

[71] See Karl Olav Sandnes, *Belly and Body in the Pauline Epistles*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 120 (Cambridge, 2002). Sandnes examines the patristic reception of Philippians 3:19 in meticulous detail.

remains, then, why Chrysostom chose to substitute "Jews" for "Judaizers" when he likely knew the passage in its original form.[72] The answer, I think, is that he used the term "Jew" to stand in for both "Jews" and "Judaizers," as he does elsewhere in his homilies, since both Jew and Judaizer share the same "inferior" status in Chysostom's body matrix.[73]

If we look closely at what follows in both translations, we can see that this is almost certainly the case. In the Latin version, the homilist addresses the audience with the following rhetorical question: "But tell me now: do such things not happen again?" (Sed nunc, dic mihi, nonne talia iterum fiunt?; Z. 26). Vercelli VII turns this question into a factual statement: ("Also the same torments are prepared for those men who *now* live such lives as they had lived" (Eac swylce þa ilcan witu syndon gearuwe þam mannum þe nu swylcum lifum lifiað swylce hie lyfedon; S.49–50; Z.26). These references to the contemporary audience demonstrate with startling clarity the enduring power of "Judaizing" logic and contagion: the "Jewish disease" has already spread to the church in the past, and will continue to do so in the present. It will remain a threat in the future, unless more rigid boundaries are established

[72] It was, after all, Paul's distinctive view that all believers in Christ were freed from the physical burdens associated with Jewish practice. As a remedy, he prescribed "spiritual circumcision," which enabled believers to "cut themselves off" psychically from carnal desires. On Chrysostom's "misuse" of Pauline categories, see Abel Mordechai Bibliowicz, "The Anti-Jewish Strand in Chrysostom," in *Jews and Gentiles in the Early Jesus Movement: An Unintended Journey* (New York, 2013), pp. 185–92; Courtney Wilson VanVeller, "John Chrysostom and the Troubling Jewishness of Paul," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, ed. Chris L. De Wet and Wendy Mayer, Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1 (Leiden, 2019), pp. 32–57.

[73] Sandnes (*Belly and Body,* pp. 244–51*)* argues that although Chrysostom was not the first exegete to substitute Jews for Judaizers in patristic exegesis, he was the most emphatic in the use of this verse to deploy anti-Judaic rhetoric. This conflation only becomes clear only once we understand the medical metaphors at play in Chrysostom's original homilies.

between Jewish and Christian bodies and identities. The very structure of the homily itself—with its motley portfolio of gluttonous, overindulgent bodies—reflects this logic of contagion.

Continuing with our passage, it is worth noting that the Vercelli VII homilist leaves out the statement in the Latin that reads "uel illi qui in eremo otium requirentes perierunt" (or those who perished wanting ease in the desert; Z. 20). Taking into account Chrysostom's other homilies on The Epistle to the Hebrews, I would like to suggest that this statement is shorthand for the Jews in the desert who "murmured against God" and demanded food, thereby demonstrating their gluttony, and also their distrust of God's plan for redemption in the wilderness—a form of idolatry according to Chrysostom.[74] For him, these narratives tell "a story about how the demands of the belly overcame belief in God's providence."[75] The word *otium* carries additional weight in the Latin text, since it invokes indolence and luxury, and because it picks up on a theme introduced in Hebrews 3 and 4, and in Chrysostom's homilies on these chapters, concerning "false rest." This concept refers to the Israelites' mistaken belief that they had inherited the true Promised Land, when in fact, they had received but a shadow of the True Rest (*requies*) in the New Jerusalem. *Otium*, or the "easy life," thus opposes the good ascetic life both in Hebrews and in Chrysostom's and Mutianus's version of our homily. Given how elusive this reference is, it would seem that the Vercelli VII author did not understand it altogether.

The next few statements appear at first to move away from the Jews to deal with other nations and people in the Old Testament whose sins included gluttony. Mutianus's text refers to the Sodomites who were said to have perished as a result of their gluttony (and not, as might be expected, for their sexual sins). The ultimate biblical source for this passage is

[74] Sandnes, *Belly and Body,* pp. 244–51. Also see Chrysostom's *Hom.* 6, on Hebrews 3:7–11; *Hom.* 7 on Hebrews 4:11–13; and *Hom.* 15 on Hebrews 9:1–5.

[75] Sandnes, *Belly and Body*, p. 205.

Ezekiel 16:49, which explains that the Sodomites "flowed away in a surfeit of bread" (on hlafes fylnesse <a>flow<o>n; S.40–41; Z.22). Interestingly Ezekiel, in the original biblical context, is speaking not about the Sodomites *per se*, but rather about Jerusalem, whose sins he alleged to be worse than those of Sodom. If I am right about this allusion, then the homilist has actually brought the discussion back full circle to Jewish profligacy.

In a few places, it looks as though the Vercelli homilist has tried to correct the disturbed order of the Latin. Picking up on the thematic link between gluttony and sexual desire, the Vercelli VII homilist adds a more conventional reference to Sodom's sexual perversions, when he writes "think also of those who perished in Sodom on account of their unlawful desires, and of those who lived in the days of Noah" (Geþenceað eac þara þe in Sodome for hira unalyfedum gewilnungum forwurdon, 7 þara þe on Noes dagum wæron; S.38–9; Z.21). The added phrase "unalyfedum gewilnungum" (unlawful desires) surely anticipates the later and now misplaced allusion (Z. 25) to "ones who with desirous frenzy sought sex with men" (þe mid wodheortnesse willan to wæpnedmannum hæmed sohton). The homilist's added phrase, "unalyfedum gewilnungum" eases the transition to sinners in the time of Noah in the next clause.

By interpreting the sins of these men in Noah's period as sexual in nature, the Vercelli homilist anticipates an allusion a few lines later to the "sons of God, who earlier were captivated by the sight of beautiful women, [and who] fell into Hell" (Godes bearn wæron þurh ænlicra wifa sceawunga to fyrenlustum gehæfte on helle gehruron). These are undoubtedly the Nephilim of Genesis 6:2 who are mentioned in the context of God's decision to destroy all of his creation in the Flood, and indeed all people apart from the Noahic family. By the end of this last passage, we have all the main elements that make up the classical critique of the "soft and easy life": namely, gluttony, idolatry, sex, and madness. Naturally, the Jew is implicated in all of these corruptions.

The task remains to work out how Chrysostom and his translators tied effeminacy to the litany of sins attributed to Jews and Old Testament sinners in this last catalogue. For this, it is necessary briefly to go back to the aforementioned statement in Vercelli VII (derived ultimately from Philippians 3:19), which stated: "be ðam wæs cweden þæt hyra wamb wære hyra god" (about them it was said that their belly was their God; S.37–8; Z. 20). The most intriguing word here is *wamb*, which the Vercelli VII homilist uses to translate *uenter* in the Latin. *Wamb* commonly means both "stomach" and "womb," but it is telling that the homilist elsewhere uses *innoðe* and *maga* for the stomach proper. The implication in Vercelli VII is that the Jews, being effeminate, have wombs that breed unprofitable and unfruitful sin. This makes the Jews all too like the soft and overindulgent women in the homily who fail to produce anything apart from more luxury and more vice. As if to make this point absolutely clear, the homilist uses the word *wamb* a second time in a passage quoted earlier to explain how food eaten in overabundance turns to dung (*meox*) in the belly (*wamb*): "Without a doubt, the enemy of the body [i.e. food eaten immoderately] will turn into the same in the belly, and also cause the weakening of the body" (S.89–91; Z.54). This gluttonous *wamb* literally produces nothing but shit. In these moments, the homilist forces us to think about the Jewish body throughout as the prime signifier of the corrupt and wanton body, in the much the way that the late Medieval *Judensau* does.

Although the vernacular wordplay on *wamb* does not have the same effect in the Latin, Mutianus found his own way to link sinners and Jews in the Old Testament with overindulgent women: going back to a passage translated earlier, it is said of the Sodomites and those who lived in the time of Noah: "nonne quia humidam et dissolutam persequuti sunt uitam?" (Did they not lead a weak and dissolute life?; Z. 22). I have translated *humidus* as "weak" to make sense of the passage, but it is clear that Mutianus also wanted to denote "moisture" or "wetness," as captured by the verb used of the Sodomites (and Jews) who flowed away (defluxerunt*;* Z.22) in the surfeit of bread. His humoral profile of the profligate

body follows the archetypal Galenic diagnosis of the effeminate body as being both wet and moist (as opposed to the ultra-masculine body, which is both dry and warm). The word-play also connects Jewish and Old Testament sinners to the soft women of his simile who are ruined when overtended—just like overmoistened trees when they are moved from the dry desert (in eremo; Z.32) to wet, moist ground (loco aquoso; Z.32).

There are also periodic indications that certain passages became increasingly anti-Judaic in the process of translation. An interesting case concerns the simile comparing the body to a house. In the Latin text of Mutianus, the temperate body, illuminated by the brilliance of the soul, is compared to a beautiful house that has been "scraped down" to reveal its beauty:

> Scitis autem quia sicut domum pulchram cum quis eraserit, efficit pulchriorem: sic etiam faciem pulchram splendor animae superueniens amplius conuenustat; si uero in moestitia sit et doloribus constituta, deformis efficitur. Moestitia namque et moerores aegritudines faciunt et dolores; aegritudine autem delicatudines corporis generantur, quae deliciis constant (Z. 46–8)
>
> However, you know that just as when someone scrapes down a beautiful house, he makes it more beautiful: so too the brilliance of the soul coming from above adorns more handsomely a beautiful face. If in truth [the soul] is established in sadness and feelings of grief, it is made deformed. In fact, sadness and feelings of sorrow generate diseases and sorrows; however, in sickness the delicate features of the body are generated, which are established in delights.

In the first line, Mutianus uses the verb *eraserit* (when he scrapes down), emending the work of a prior Latin translator, who had written *aer arriserit* (when the air laughs), in agreement

with the Greek original. Mutianus clearly intuited the idea that one should "scrape away" or "make clean or smooth" the body following a minimalist, ascetic ideal. Interestingly, the Old English author has changed the text yet again:

> Hwæt, ge witon ðæt ælc hus bið þe fægere þe hit man hwitað. Swa eac bið ælc lichoma ðe fægerra þe hine þære sawle scima gebyrhtet Sona se lichoma sceal bion unfæger, þonne he mid unrotnesse 7 mid sare aseted bið, ða cumað of ðam liðan olehtunge (S. 78–82; Z. 46–8).
>
> Alas, you know that each house is that much fairer when one whitens it.
> So too is the body that much fairer when the radiance of the soul brightens it.
> Immediately the body shall be ugly when it is beset by unhappiness and with sorrow, which come from soft indulgences.[76]

The Old English author renders *eraserit* as *hwitað* (whitewash, whiten), a verb which almost always glosses the Latin *dealbere*, meaning "to whitewash," and by extension "to purify" (rather than *erasere*, which has the sense of "to root out" or "to rub away").[77] My hypothesis

[76] I argued before that the Old English translator makes an important change in assuming that the body becomes fairer and uglier, whereas the Latin argues that the body and soul share this deformity as the result of sin. This may have been deliberate or the result of his misunderstanding the Latin text. Although *constituta* is feminine, and must therefore refer to *anima*, or perhaps to the woman herself as an agent, the Old English translator seems wrongly to assume that it refers to *corpus*, which is neuter.

[77] See, for example, the use of *erasere* in the Vulgate text of 1 Kings (1 Samuel) 28:9: "Et ait mulier ad eum: Ecce, tu nosti quanta fecerit Saul, et quomodo *eraserit* magos et hariolos de terra: quare ergo insidiaris animae meae, ut occidar?"; (And the woman said to him: Behold thou knowest all that Saul hath done, and how he hath *rooted out* the magicians and soothsayers from the land: why then dost thou lay a snare for my life, to cause me to be put to death?) (italics mine).

is that the Vercelli VII translator substituted the verb *hwitan* to bring it closer to Matthew 23:27, which concerns the hypocrisy of the Pharisees (quoted here from the Vulgate) who appear outwardly beautiful, but in reality are full of vice and filth:

> Vae vobis scribae et pharisaei hypocritae, quia similes estis sepulchris dealbatis, quae a foris parent hominibus speciosa, intus vero pleni sunt ossibus mortuorum, et omni spurcitia!
>
> Woe to you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; because you are like to whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear to men beautiful, but within are full of dead men's bones, and of all filthiness.

The Old English homilist may have recalled Chrysostom's homily 12 on Hebrews 7:1–3, which utilizes this very passage from Matthew to contrast the false self-beautification of the Pharisees, with the honest and true purification of bodies and souls by the righteous. The Vercelli author has clearly remembered that Jewishness is connected with ugliness in Chrysostom's body matrix.

Taking a long view of Vercelli VII's passage about Jews derived from Philippians 3:19, we are now in the position to see that it offers (albeit in a highly allusive manner) a profile of carnal sins that are made to sound endemic to the Jewish body—with the notable exception of the virtuous patriarchs in the previous catalogue who managed to escape or repress their carnal desires. The idea that Jews can be temperate or intemperate, moderate or gluttonous, adheres perfectly to the logic of the "one-sex / one-religion" spectrum. However, such flexibility surely undermines Chrysostom's general insistence that the Jewish body is antithetical to the Christian ascetic ideal. His attempt to assert rigid bodily difference is bound to fail according to the logic of his own body matrix, wherein difference is always constructed

as being both porous and plastic. This paradox captures the structural weaknesses of anti-Judaic rhetoric in general—Judaism, as the antecedent of Christianity is inseparable from it.

My rereading of Vercelli VII and its sources encourages a new way of thinking about the continued currency of anti-Judaism in the Middle Ages. The reproduction of anxieties about Jews and Judaizers in Vercelli VII suggests that the term "Judaizer" might productively be widened from Paul's original use of the term to refer to schismatics within his own mission, and even from Chrysostom's use of the term to refer to Christians who cling to Jewish practices and rituals. In the case of Vercelli VII, the term "Judaizer" denotes something at once more abstract and more global—in this case, all Christians who practise like Jews according to the inherited hierarchies and stereotypes embedded in the "one-sex / one religion model." In Vercelli VII, all gluttons, perverts, and idolaters are always *like Jews*. The decisive moment where this transference becomes crystal clear is when the homilist addresses his contemporary audience and castigates them for engaging in Jewish-like behaviours and for "doing now" what Jews "did then." This formulation, I think, helps to explain why the Jewish body remained the arch signifier of difference and alterity in a culture that had no Jewish population to speak of. Under these circumstances, the Jew became, in effect, representative of "the potential Jew" within all of us—in this case a soft, effeminate, overindulgent, oversexed, idolatrous being that requires reform, taming, and continual restraint. It gave a simple and memorable name to the complex of sins that so many Christian authors wanted to denounce: Jew.[78]

In the end, Chrysostom's homily 29, and its Latin and Old English translations demonstrate a model of abasement and abjection that is not terribly far from the complex of scatological and sexual perversions united in the image of the *Judensau*. In fact, we might think of Vercelli VII as a missing link in a new narrative about anti-Judaism in the Middle

[78] This argument receives further explication and elaboration in Zacher, *The Fear of Becoming Jewish*.

Ages—a link that troubles the rigid periodization assigned to the rise of somatic anti-Judaism in the late Middle Ages.

L1 The Pains and Pleasures of Vercelli Homily IX and the Delights of Textual Transmission

Jonathan Wilcox

Old English homilies can provide a window into the thought-world of a millennium ago, but the view they provide is constrained by the parameters of their conventions. Homilies convey a deeply conventional message in often predictable language: do good, avoid sin, love God and thy neighbour, practise Christian charity and come to merit heaven rather than hell at the Last Judgement. The present essay will explore what can be seen in a rare moment that flouts certain homiletic conventions. I will focus on a single preaching text, Vercelli IX, where the homilist pursues the traditional themes in a distinctive and unusual way, namely by deploying both sex and humour to capture an audience's attention. The homily survives in multiple manuscript versions, each of which is somewhat distinct. I will take advantage of this rich transmission history to pinpoint Anglo-Saxon users' concerns about key passages, suggesting that such unease helps establish variation from Old English homiletic norms. I will suggest that this one homily is strikingly fruitful for exploring Anglo-Saxon attitudes to sex and humour precisely because the variation shows that many copyists chose to modify or suppress just those parts.

Vercelli IX centres on a forceful warning of the coming of judgement at the end of this transitory life, for which, the homilist says, people are all too unprepared.[1] The homilist reflects on the nature of death and the need to attend to the fate of the soul. Most of the

[1] *VH*, pp. 151–90. Scragg's analysis in this edition is fundamental to understanding the homily. Vercelli IX is translated in Charles D. Wright, *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*, CSASE 6 (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 277–91, and by Patricia Quattrin in *The Vercelli Book Homilies: Translations from the Anglo-Saxon*, ed. Lewis E. Nicholson (Lanham, 1991), pp. 65–71.

homily describes the joys of heaven and, much more extensively, the woes of hell, with a final injunction to therefore cease sins, practise alms and good works, and seek out church with purity and humble prayer.[2] In developing these themes, the homilist shows a love of lists, obsessively enumerating, among other traits, the capital sins and the seven virtues, the seven pains of hell, the three deaths, which include a closing down of the five senses, and the five likenesses of hell, in what has been aptly termed the enumerative style.[3] The homily's other distinctive rhetorical turn is the use of memorable extended similes. In the most extended version of these, the homilist uses the voice of the devil talking to an anchorite to provide images for the littleness of earth, the extreme noisiness of hell, and the sense of well-being in heaven, with an exuberance that outdoes other homilists.[4] In a homily that has already spent considerable energy describing heaven and hell, this expansion in the voice of the devil creates exaggeration with possibly comic effect and this will be the main focus of my analysis here.

The underlying building blocks for passages describing heaven and hell in Old English literature are mostly predictable and recurring, frequently featuring *þær is* followed by "an enumeration of nouns indicating various kinds of pain, suffering or, inversely, joy or physical

---

[2] Two studies are of particular value for insights into Vercelli IX: Wright, *Irish Tradition*, provides fundamental source work and contextualizing, and Samantha Zacher, *Preaching the Converted: The Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Book Homilies*, TASS 1(Toronto, 2009), esp. chap. 6, provides an analysis of style.

[3] See Wright, *The Irish Tradition*, esp. chap. 2 "The 'enumerative style' in Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England"; see also Stephen Pelle, "The Seven Pains of Hell: The Latin Source of an Old English Homiletic Motif," *RES* n.s. 62 (2011), 167–80.

[4] See Samantha Zacher, "Rereading the Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Homilies," in *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. Aaron J. Kleist (Turnhout, 2007), p. 178. This part is edited and discussed by Fred C. Robinson, "The Devil's Account of the Next World," *NM* 73 (1972), 362–71, repr. in his *The Editing of Old English* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 196–205.

benefit," as Hildegard Tristram has shown. A variant uses litotes to express what is not present and, as Tristram observes, "[t]he lists of physical and mental privations and miseries absent in heaven are usually much longer than the lists of pleasures."[5] In the Vercelli Homilies as a group, these essential building blocks get expanded by the use of extended similes, as Samantha Zacher has demonstrated, and such extended conceits set in the subjunctive mode are especially prominent in Vercelli IX.[6] The cases I will consider raise the question of whether homiletic motifs could push to such extremes of exaggeration that an audience might react to them as funny.[7] And can attentiveness to the process of transmission give clues as to how an audience in Anglo-Saxon times received such passages? The former question will encourage a careful rhetorical analysis of selected passages, while the latter will require working over some of the small but telling differences in their transmission.

L2 Expressing the Inexpressible

The issue can be seen in perhaps the most famous inexpressibility topos from the homily. In describing the fifth torment of hell, the homilist explains:

[5] Hildegard L.C. Tristram, "Stock Descriptions of Heaven and Hell in Old English Prose and Poetry," *NM* 79 (1978), 102–13, quoted from pp. 102 and 104.

[6] Zacher, *Preaching the Converted*, chap. 6. For an earlier reading of the style, see Paul E. Szarmach, "The Vercelli Homilies: Style and Structure," in *The Old English Homily and Its Backgrounds*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach and Bernard F. Huppé (Albany, 1978), pp. 241–44.

[7] Theories of humour are, of course, both capacious and contested, but appropriate incongruity is central to most; see my essay, "Understatement and Incongruity: Humour in the Literature of Anglo-Saxon England," in *Humour in the Arts: New Perspectives*, ed. Vivienne Westbrook and Shun-liang Chao (New York, 2019), pp. 59–77, for an attempt to work out the possibilities in relation to Anglo-Saxon humour.

> 7 þeah .vii. men sien, 7 þara hæbbe æghylc twa 7 hundsiofontig gereorda, swa feala swa ealles þysses middangeardes gereorda syndon, and þonne sy þara seofon manna æghwylc to alife gesceapen, 7 hyra hæbbe æghwylc siofon [heafdu, 7 þara heafdu ælc hæbbe siofon] tungan, 7 þara tungena ælc hæbbe isene stemne, 7 þonne hwæðre ne magon þa ealle ariman helle witu.
> (Vercelli IX [**AE**], lines 108–13)

> and even if there were seven people, and each of those had seventy-two languages, as many languages as there are in all of this world, and then each of those seven people were created to eternal-life, and each of them had seven heads, and each of those heads had seven tongues, and each of those tongues had a voice of iron, and even then they could not enumerate all the torments of hell.[8]

Initially striking here is the concatenation of numbers, which exemplify the homilist's love of enumeration. The idea of inexpressible torments which could not be recited even if the speaker had a hundred tongues, a hundred mouths and a voice of iron, is drawn from Virgil's account of Hades in the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, modified by way of the *Visio Pauli* account of hell, as Wright has shown.[9] The extremity of the listing points to a serious paradox of disquieting uncanniness, uncovered here in a rhetorical *tour de force* articulated, ironically

[8] Translations are my own. I have attempted to maintain gender undifferentiated language in a way that reflects the original, even though the boundaries are different in the two languages and the gender inclusiveness of Old English *man* is often dependent on an understanding of context. A present subjunctive in the original is sometimes best expressed with a past perfect in the translation.

[9] Wright, *Irish Tradition*, pp. 145–48. "Nay, had I a hundred tongues, a hundred mouths, and voice of iron, I could not sum up all the forms of crime, or rehearse all the tale of torments," *Aeneid* VI.625–27.

and yet appropriately, by a devil. Torments that cannot be described are, by definition, beyond the power of human language to conjure, but stumping the devil expands the scope of such inexpressibility. The whole motif has been well written on as an exuberant expresion of a seriously cautionary point, but without engaging the possibility of humour.[10]

For all the serious purpose, is this paradox of inexpressibility expressed by an incongruous speaker not also (potentially) funny? For me, it is easy to pinpoint the breaking point where exaggeration turns to the comic. The choice of seven individuals as the putative mouth-piece is hyperbolic but not excessive and any unease at the choric effect is disrupted by the apparently didactic parenthesis as the homilist cannot resist digressing on the number of languages known in the world, a piece of encyclopedic knowledge lacking any sense of comic tone.[11] The image moves to a more extreme level as those seven speakers are imagined for a moment "to alife gesceapen," (created to eternal life) (line 111 from MS **A**, or "a to life gesceapen" [created eternally for life] in MSS **E** and **L**). Now we are in a counter-factual world of a thought experiment, hinted perhaps by that noun, *alif*, being a unique survival from this homily,[12] but it is hardly an extreme thought experiment in the context of the eternal verities of the Last Judgement and heaven and hell. For such serious business, it seems reasonable to imagine seven speakers and the hypothesis that they are given eternal life to make their speeches. The tonal shift to the exuberant comes, to my ear, with the next item in

[10] See Robinson, "Devil's Account of the Next World"; Scragg, "The Devil's Account of the Next World Revisted," *ANQ* 24 (1986), 107–10; Wright, *Irish Tradition*, pp. 145–56; Zacher, *Preaching the Converted*, p. 217. Winfried Rudolf, "The Spiritual Islescape of the Anglo-Saxons," in *The Sea and Englishness in the Middle Ages: Maritime Narratives, Identity and Culture*, ed. Sebastian Sobecki (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 31–57, convincingly demonstrates the memorable nature of the image.

[11] The number is based on the tribes of Israel; see Hans Sauer, "Die 72 Völker und Sprachen der Welt: ein mittelalterliche Topos in der englischen Literatur," *Anglia* 101 (1982), 29–48.

[12] Albeit used twice; the second usage, at Scragg's line 203, is in the more predictable context of life in heaven.

the reduplicating series, as each speaker is imagined with seven heads. This hints at the topsy-turvy world of the riddles, where unreasonable numbers of body-parts will be resolved into forms likely (such as a plough or a rake) or unlikely (such as a bagpipe or one-eyed seller of garlic) rather than in the uncanny world of Revelations.[13] That element of exuberance through excess is repeated when each head is imagined to have seven tongues. Exaggeration is a fundamental technique for creating the incongruity of humour, and the incongruity of such a plenitude of body parts may have slid from a design for terror to a touch of humour. It seems to me that raising a smile here might be a deliberate performative ploy, even if the broad context (the fear of hell for our misdeeds) is no laughing matter. A highly formulaic pattern is particularly ripe for comic variation, and a good homilist might choose to deploy humour to keep the audience's attention for serious effect. Such a reading, however was controversial even at the time of the homily, as the evidence of transmission suggests.

The text presented above is Scragg's best attempt at recreating the original of the homily, based largely on the wording of the Vercelli Book (his MS **A**), with support from a version of the homily that is substantially similar preserved in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 340 (Scragg's MS **E**). Much of the same homily, but with a distinctive beginning and end and some different material in the middle, along with a number of smaller variants, survives in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115 (Scragg's MS **L**), which is presented fully in Scragg's edition as a facing-page parallel text (referred to here as Vercelli IX [**L**]). Some of this same homily survives in a different narrative context in BL, Cotton Tiberius A. iii (Scragg's MS **M**), which is edited separately by Robinson as "The Devil's Account of the

[13] See Exeter Book riddles 21, 34, 31, and 86 respectively. The Book of Revelation is certainly an exemplar for the obsessively enumerative style, and the apocalyptic analogy would be to the seven heads of the red dragon of Revelation 12:3 or the beast of Revelation 13:1 and 17:3–9.

Next World."[14] A short free-standing extract survives in the twelfth-century manuscript, CCCC 303, Scragg's MS **H**, under the title *De inclusis*. Other extracts survive in the context of different homilies, namely in Napier XLIII in CCCC 419, Scragg's MS **N**;[15] in Napier XXX in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 113, Scragg's MS **O**; and in two more composite pieces contained in Cotton Tiberius A. iii (**M**, namely in Napier XLIV and a confessional text [Cameron B11.10.3]). Such complexity of transmission is hard to capture in an edition, but Scragg does an impressive job, presenting the homily from **A** and **E** on one page, the complete version in **L** on the facing page, and **M** and the other excerpts in a lower deck, and explaining in his textual introduction why all witnesses are of value for recreating the homily.[16]

Such a wealth of witnesses is unusual but not unparalleled for an anonymous homily. Whereas homilies by Ælfric habitually survive in relatively stable textual versions through which it is possible to detect minute details of authorial revision,[17] anonymous homilies incline towards two distinct patterns of textual survival. Most occur in only single copies, perhaps indicative of limited and local circulation.[18] A few, though, are attested in multiple copies, and in such cases there is often so much variation between manuscripts that it is hard

[14] See above, n. 4.

[15] The complete homily is Napier, pp. 205–15.

[16] Scragg, as n. 1. Fuller details about date and place of composition, provenance and circulation of manuscripts will be provided below in the course of working through the implications of the transmission.

[17] See the introductions of Peter Clemoes in *CH* I, and Malcolm Godden in *CH* II, and, most recently, Aaron J. Kleist, *The Chronology and Canon of Ælfric of Eynsham*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 37 (Cambridge, 2019).

[18] This is a point made by R. I. Page, "An Old English Fragment from Westminster Abbey," *ASE* 25 (1996), 201–7.

to say whether each version constitutes the same or a distinct work.[19] Sunday Letter homilies, about a letter by God prohibiting Sunday work, for example, include multiple related pairs that are best presented through facing-page editions, including the examples Napier XLIII and XLIV.[20] This kind of complex overlap is what will be so nicely captured in the ECHOE project and illustrates well the complexities of establishing a convenient terminology for naming separate homilies or understanding the limits of an individual text.[21]

The relatively abundant witnesses suggest that Vercelli IX was a popular homily, although it is worth observing that the pattern of preservation includes a hint that the homily was not popular with everyone, since it is lacking from one collection where it would be expected. The core content of Bodley 340/342, MS **E**, mostly comprising homilies by Ælfric, is reproduced as the core content of a subsequent southeastern manuscript, CCCC 198, Scragg's MS **F**.[22] Only one homily was not included in the recopying, namely Vercelli IX. Apparently **F**'s compiler decided that Vercelli IX was uniquely not to his taste. In its place is substituted a homily by Ælfric, *CH* II, IV, a post-Epiphany homily that is not included in **E**.

---

[19] On the circulation of the Vercelli Homilies, see *VH* (as n. 1); and D. G. Scragg, "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric," *ASE* 8 (1979), 223–77.

[20] See *Sunday Observance and the Sunday Letter in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. and trans. Dorothy Haines, Anglo-Saxon Texts 8 (Cambridge, 2010), homilies E and F. See also Stephen Pelle's essay above.

[21] https://echoe.uni-goettingen.de. Accessed 2020 May 2.

[22] On the relevant core collection of CCCC 198, see *CH* I, pp. 10–12 (where CCCC 198 has the sigel **E**). The core collection includes Vercelli V, VIII, and III, all drawn from Bodley 340/342. See also Godden, *CH* II, pp. xxviii–xxxi, who clarifies that CCCC 198 is not copied directly from Bodley 340/342 but, in view of shared errors, has a common source at some remove from Ælfric. For a fuller account of the make-up of the core collection, see D. G. Scragg, "The Homilies of the Blickling Manuscript," in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 309–15.

Such a complete omission suggests that this homily was controversial, and the likely source of the unease of the compiler of **F** can be pinpointed through transmission choices preserved in other manuscripts. In the example under consideration here, the clause about the seven heads (lines 111–12, presented in square brackets) is missing from the Vercelli Book and from Bodley 340 (MSS **A** and **E**) and is provided by Scragg from Hatton 115 (MS **L**). Scragg speculates that this is a case of eye-skip by the scribe of the common copy of **A** and **E**,[23] a distinct possibility in view of the repetition within the passage, but the resulting effect is notable and might suggest a different cause. In place of what I see as the comic breaking point, **A** and **E** circulate with a slightly more sober image, namely seven people, each with seven tongues, each with a voice of iron, an image that is easier to accept as metaphorically powerful and yet not incongruously excessive. Could the omission made in the common exemplar to **A** and **E** be due to a transmitter who baulked at the risk of making his audience smile? That is a suggestion that will gain credibility from considering further examples from the homily. The versions in Hatton 115 (Vercelli IX [**L**], lines 84–88) and in CCCC 419 (Vercelli IX [**N**], lines 7–12), while each somewhat distinct, parade the exaggerated body parts and present the listener with a multiply-tongue-tied speaker with seven heads, with potentially humorous effect.

Two other uses in anonymous Rogationtide homilies indicate that this image was seen as memorable and effective by other compilers, perhaps on account of the humour. A loosely-structured homily, *In uigilia ascensionis,* surviving in CCCC 303, pp. 223–26, includes a picture of heavenly bliss drawn from homiletic commonplaces.[24] This includes the inexpressibility topos conveyed through a yet more unlikely version of the image, this time (failing) to describe the joys of heaven:

---

[23] Scragg comments "homeoteleuton" (see *VH*, p. 170).

[24] See Bazire-Cross, pp. 57–59, who describe the nature of the compilation.

> Ðeah þe wære twa and hundseofontig manna and hæfde ælc þara manna twa and hundsefontig heafodo and ælc þæra hæfda twa and hundseofonti tungena and ælc þære tungena hæfde twa and hundseofontig gereorda and hig swa lange spræcan þæt hi ealle wæron werig, ne mihten hi þone teoðan dæl asecgan… (Bazire-Cross IV, lines 85–89)
>
> Even if there were seventy-two people and each of those people had seventy-two heads and each of those heads seventy-two tongues and each of those tongues had seventy-two languages and they spoke for such a long time that they were exhausted, they could not tell the tenth part…

of how many bright trees or how many white blossoms there are in the seven heavens. This version surely results from a partial remembering of a version like that in Vercelli IX, with the number of languages now providing the number of speakers, and of their heads, and of their tongues. With the image so unhinged from the normal requirements of biological veracity, the number of heads on the multiply-endowed speakers doesn't have any particular limit, although the increased number makes the image even more fanciful. The result is an ear-catching detail in a not especially careful sermon that seems designed to take advantage of the sensational for grabbing attention.

The same is true of another loosely-structured Rogationtide homily, *Feria tertia de letania maiore*, in Hatton 114, fols. 111r–14v. Here the same image is once again deployed to convey the inexpressibility of describing hell:

> And ðær is wanunga and wita ma þonne æniges mannes earan ahlystan magon ne nanes mannes tunga nis to þam swyft, þeah þe he hæbbe XII heafdu and ðæra heafdu æghwylc hæbbe XII tungan and ðæra tunga æghwylc hæbbe XII stefna and ðæra

> stefna gehwylc hæbbe snyttro Salomones; ne magon hi þeahhwæðere ealle þa witu ariman ne areccan… (Bazire-Cross XI, lines 89–94)[25]
>
> And there is more lamentation and torment than the ears of any person can hear, nor is the tongue of any person swift enough, even if he may have twelve heads and each of those heads have twelve tongues, and each of those tongues have twelve voices, and each of those voices have the wisdom of Solomon, nevertheless they could not tell or relate all the torments…

Here the image has been picked up with a lack of close verbal correlation that suggests a preacher remembering a feature that he considers worth reproducing in his own loosely associative sermon.[26] The reference to the wisdom of Solomon might be a detail occurring to the homilist because he remembers another part of Vercelli IX or might simply be another commonplace. In any event, the homilist here imposes his own sense of memorable style with the alliterating doublets (*wanunga and wita*, *ariman ne areccan*), a stylistic preference for paired balance that is seen also in the balance between ears and tongue. The number of the multiple heads, tongues, and voices could be a simple error,[27] or simply a selection of a striking round number in a context where the precise number doesn't really matter. The image is fanciful and a shade sensational in this context and possibly humorous.

L2 The Din of Hell

[25] Also edited as Fadda VI, pp. 125–37.

[26] Bazire and Cross comment: "No particular thought has been given to delicate control over word, or, indeed, to accuracy of citation. The sermon appears to be written freely without reference to a book," (see Bazire-Cross, p. 136).

[27] Bazire and Cross (pp. 60–61, n. 12) suggest a miscopying of the Roman number lxxii as 'xii.'

Even though the exuberant image of the seven heads is aimed at expressing how inexpressible the torments of hell are, a homilist has to try, and the Vercelli IX homilist makes plentiful attempts at just such a description. He continues with an extended image of the pain a person who had visited hell for one night would suffer rather than return to hell for one more night, namely the sensation of being suspended for seven thousand years from the tallest tree over the highest sea-cliff with blood flowing from the mouth while being beaten by crashing waves and visited by all earthly torments—all of which he will suffer lovingly rather than visit hell for another night (Vercelli IX [**AE**], lines 122–30; the same details but with tighter syntax are given in Vercelli IX [**L**], lines 90–98). This is an extended image that has seen much attention since it fits so well into the uncanny landscape also described in Blickling XVI and *Beowulf*.[28] While clearly exaggerated beyond the the point of the imaginable (note, for example, the seven thousand years), the exaggeration here plays up the grotesque and the uncanny rather than slides towards a comic tone. The one possible exception is the phrase *luflice þrowian* (lovingly endure) for the reaction to such excess in **A**, line 130, where the adverb is so extremely incongruous it might signal humour. Interestingly, this very adverb is erased from **E** (Bodley 340, fol. 38v/19), suggesting that some reviser of the text in that version found the oxymoron too extreme to include.[29]

Another extended image by the homilist more clearly pushes to the humorous. The homilist continues describing the woes of hell in a balanced rhetorical list, then switches again to the voice of the devil speaking to the anchorite, first explaining the narrow space of the

[28] See Wright, *Irish Tradition*, pp. 113–45; Zacher, *Preaching*, pp. 220–21; Rudolf, "Spiritual Islescape," pp. 39–46; Andy Orchard, *A Critical Companion to Beowulf* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 155–58; *Klaeber's Beowulf*, ed. R. D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, 4th ed., Toronto Old English Series (Toronto, 2009), p. clxxviii.

[29] Vercelli IX in Bodley 340 has been subject to extensive visible revision, which merits additional study. The two other witnesses at this point have a slightly duller image: "lustlice geþafian/þolian" in MS **L**, line 96, and **M**, line 15.

earthly *middangeard* surrounded by ocean as like a mere prick in a wax-tablet (Vercelli IX [**AE**], lines 144–50), and then amplifying this with an extended simile establishing the soundscape:

> And he, se deofol, þa gyt cwæð to þam ancran: "Gyf ænig mann wære ane niht on helle 7 he eft wære æfter þam ofalædd, 7 ðeah man þone garsecg mid isene utan ymbtynde, 7 þonne ealne gefylde mid fyres lige up oþ ðone heofonas hrof, 7 utan embsette hine þonne ealne mid byligeon 7 heora æghwylc oðres æthrinan mihte, 7 to æghwylcum þæra byligea wære man geset 7 se hæfde Samsones strengðe (se wæs ealra eorðwarena strengest þe ær oððe syððan æfre gewurde) 7 þeah man þonne gesette an brad isen þell ofer þæs fyres hrof, 7 þeah hit wære eall mid mannum afylled 7 ðæra æghwylc hæfde ænne hamor on handa, 7 þeah man bleowe mid eallum þam byligeon 7 mid þam hameron beote on þær isene þell and se lig brastlode, ne awacode he næfre for eallum þisum, to ðam werig he wære for þære anre nihthwile."
> (Vercelli IX, main text [here MS **O**, see below], lines 151–63)

> And he, that devil, then said further to the anchorite: "If any person were a single night in hell and he was led away again after that, and even if a person surrounded the ocean around with iron, and then filled it all with flames of fire up to the roof of heaven, and set about it on the outside then completely with bellows and each of them might touch the next, and a person were set to each of those bellows and that one had the strength of Samson (that one was the strongest of all inhabitants of earth who ever was before or since) and even if one then set a broad iron cover over the roof of that fire, and even if it was completely filled up with people and each of those had a hammer in his hand, and even if one blew with all those bellows and beat with those hammers on the iron

> cover and the flame roared, he would not wake up for all of this, being weary to that extent on account of that single period of a night."

While the excessive commotion of hell may be a commonplace, the Vercelli homilist goes about giving that concept new attention-grabbing life. Striking here is the amplification, which is uneconomical to such an extent as to suggest incongruity and the resulting possibility of humour. This image takes the idea of the racket of the smithy,[30] and amplifies it beyond measure, first by imagining a space for the commotion that is the size of the whole ocean, next by defining that space with an almost limitless construction of iron, and then by providing not just the hammers but also the bellows of all those iron-workers, themselves described in leisurely detail.[31] The smelting of iron depends upon a hot flame achieved by the pumping of a bellows, and these tools turn out to be a favourite of the Old English riddlers' imagination in riddles that play with the strength and masculine prowess of the one who mans the bellows, an apparent master who nevertheless serves his servant's purpose.[32] In the homily, the men pumping the bellows are imagined as having the strength of the strongest of men, namely Samson (whose strength is made apparent in one of those needless scholarly parentheses, matching the explanation of the seventy-two languages in the earlier extended simile, and adding to the dilatory effect), and the plenitude of such pumpers is emphasized since they are contiguous to the point of touching one another. A reprise of the bellows and the hammers and the flames blowing and the beating and crackling in the pre-penultimate

---

[30] Compare, for example, the fifteenth-century lyric in BL Arundel 292, fol. 71v (ed. as "The Smiths" by Thomas J. Garbáty, *Medieval English Literature* (Lexington, MA, 1984), p. 671).

[31] An inconceivably strong house of iron is a folk motif found, for example, in stories associated with *The Mabinogion*, where it nevertheless fails to achieve the required end; see Wright, *Irish Tradition*, pp. 194–206.

[32] Exeter Book *Riddles* 37 and 87, ed. George P. Krapp and Elliott van Kirk Dobbie, *The Exeter Book*, ASPR 3 (New York, 1936).

clause maintains a kind of leisurely excess in the wording that contributes mightily to the expansiveness here. The image overflows with exuberant excess, which might elicit wonder and awe in an audience, but might also elicit a smile. One added rhetorical touch seems to me to clinch it for humour, namely the extreme anti-climax of the ending. After so much crowding and so much effort describing so much noise, it is a disproportionate falling-off for all these rhetorical tricks of loudness simply to fall on deaf ears, to leave the putative escapee from hell not just not overwhelmed, but, apparently, still asleep. The extremity of such bathos, I suggest, encourages a smile at the comic incongruity.

Again, the textual transmission is interestingly suggestive of controversial reception by Anglo-Saxon preachers. The Vercelli Book (**A**) is missing this passage due to the loss of a leaf after fol. 63 and Scragg fills in the lacuna from other witnesses, a reconstruction confirmed by the size of the gap in the manuscript.[33] This time, however, the whole extended simile is lacking from Bodley 340 (**E**), and so Scragg turns to Hatton 113 (**O**), where passages are drawn into the free-standing homily, Napier XXX, which, for the extracts that it uses, Scragg shows "to be very close to **A**, probably derived from the immediate archetype of **A**."[34] The omission from **A**, then, is due to the chance loss of a page, but the omission from **E** is deliberate, with no gap in the manuscript, and results from careful editing to remove the passage. Apparently some transmitter of this homily in the chain leading to **E** found the image not to his taste and excised it wholesale. One compiler, then, did not appreciate this style of extreme excess and took away the resulting risk of comedy.

---

[33] Zacher, *Preaching*, p. 219, n. 91, gives the word per page count of this portion of the MS as between 251 and 274, which means that the 523 words given by Scragg at lines 125–67 would fit nicely on the two pages of the missing leaf.

[34] *VH*, p. 156; cf. Scragg, "Napier's 'Wulfstan' Homily XXX: Its Sources, Its Relationship to the Vercelli Book and Its Style," *ASE* 6 (1977), 197–211.

The extended image also survives in various forms in three other witnesses. This is a passage where terror is amplified through humour, and the rich diversity of verbal detail in the different versions shows that the comic potential was appreciated by different preacher-compilers. The broad image is the same in Hatton 115 (Vercelli IX [**L**], lines 140–51), where the explanatory parenthesis provides yet more scholarly information about Samson with an enumerative quality that seems characteristic of the homilist's delights, but also a dilatory quality that might suggest reveling in the joke. This version is a little less wordy than **O**, which makes for slightly smoother syntax, but it retains the reduplicative summary ("7 hit þonne aginne eal samod brastlian 7 þa bylias blawan 7 þæt fyr dynian 7 þa hamoras beatan"), with a plenitude in the repetition that builds up the anticlimax of the final idea. In what may be the most clearly comic version, **L** provides an efficient sentence that still contains excess which is exploited in the surprising (anti-)climax.

Other preachers also appreciated this potentially comic effect. The passage survives in Cotton Tiberius A. iii (**M**) as part of the independent item providing the Devil's Account of the Next World, where it is close to the version in **L**, but with a few telling differences. Vercelli IX (**M**), lines 37–49, has a less dilatory recapitulation ("and hit þonne anginne eal ætgidre brastligan 7 þa hameras beatan"), and the climactic statement of effect presents a somewhat different punchline, namely, that all of this racket and drama is not enough to distract even for half an hour the soul that has been in hell for a single night. Again, the extreme disparity between the image of incredible noise, with all its redundance of fanciful detail, and the smallness of the effect creates a comic incongruity. CCCC 303 (**H**) preserves a stream-lined version with a more rationalized conclusion, where the weary soul has suffered such afflictions in hell that it is incapable of rising, even for this racket. The preservation here as part of a short free-standing item squeezed into the manuscript indicates that the passage caught a compiler's attention as an effective preaching exemplum.

L2 Imagining the Other Place: The Joys of Heaven

While much imaginative energy gets expended in attempting to describe hell in Old English homilies, heaven tends to get shorter shrift, often being characterized in terms of the negative of the pains of hell. Vercelli IX makes a stab at a positive description, again placing an extended image in the mouth of a devil speaking to an anchorite.[35] This time, it is not a question of creating humour but rather a question of imaginative decorum that can be teased out through the various versions. In a turn that is (I believe) unique in Old English, one of many points of comparison for imagining heaven is the pleasure of the sexual act. This is an image that gets handled differently in each version, signalling the way it was unfamiliar and perhaps uncomfortable territory for Anglo-Saxon preacher-compilers. Teasing out the textual transmission here is particularly worthwhile as it uncovers something of Anglo-Saxon attitudes towards sexual pleasure which are usually so hard to recover.

Here is the passage in Scragg's edition of MS **A**, with all editorial interventions described in footnotes, since the precise wording, including mistakes, is going to be of interest:

> Þeah þær sy eal smætegylden mor æt sunnan upgange on neorxnawange, 7 se oferhlifige[36] ealle iorðan, 7 se man mote sittan swa dyre swa cynebearn ofer ðam gyldenan more, 7 hæbbe Salemanes wlite 7 wisdom, 7 him sie eal middangeard on geweald geseald, mid ðam gestreonum þe geond ealne middan[geard][37] syndon, 7 him

[35] In the version in **M** the rationalization is given that the devil is a fallen angel and so knows whereof he speaks.

[36] **A** has "7 sio oferhlifað"; Scragg corrects what he sees as a scribe's mistaken sense of the sun rising rather than the mountain towering, note to line 186.

[37] **A** has "middan"; Scragg provides the emendation, line 189.

sy ælce niht niwe bryd to bedde gelæd 7 sio hæbbe [Iu]none[38] wlite, Saturnes dohtor, 7 ælc stan sy gylden, 7 ealle þa streamas hunige flowen, 7 him þonne ne sie ofer eorðan nænig wiðerbreca, 7 þeah þe [him][39] syn ealle sundercræftas 7 wuldorsangas in gesamnode, 7 þeah þe hiene ealle frefran, 7 him sien ealle swetnessa to gelædde mid þam fægerestan gestreonum, 7 him þonne sy singal sumor butan ælcre onwendednes[se],[40] 7 he mote alybban [butan][41] sare, 7 þonne gif he wære [æ]r[42] ane niht on heofona rices wuldre, þonne for[lete][43] he þæt he ær on þyssum wuldre gelyfede, þe ic ær bisæde, ofer þæt heofena rice þe he ær on wæs þa ane niht, 7 he eft ne mote to heofena rices wuldre.

(Vercelli IX [**A**], lines 185–200, with Scragg's emendations)

even if there were a mountain all of pure gold at the rising of the sun in paradise, and it towered over all the earth, and a man might sit as splendidly as a royal offspring on top of that golden mountain, and he might have the beauty and wisdom of Solomon, and all the world was given to his power, along with the treasures which there are throughout the world, and a new bride was led to him each night and she might have the beauty of Juno, Saturn's daughter, and each rock were golden, and all the streams flowed with honey, and there were no adversary for him over the earth, and even if all special skills and glorious songs came together in him, and even if all were to comfort

[38] **A** has "enone": Förster 1913 suggested the emendation to *Iunone*, which is adopted by Scragg, line 190.

[39] **A** lacks "him" which is supplied by Scragg, line 193.

[40] **A** has "onwendednes"; Scragg provides the emendation, line 196.

[41] **A** lacks "butan" which is supplied by Scragg, line 196. Scragg observes in his note to lines 196–200 that this passage has become garbled in transmission to **A**.

[42] **A** has "her"; Scragg provides the emendation, line 197.

[43] **A** has "for"; Scragg provides the emendation, line 197; Szarmach 1981 emends to *forgeate*.

> him, and all sweetness with the most beautiful treasures might be led to him, and for him then there might be continuous summer without any change, and he might live forever without sorrow, and yet if he were previously one single night in the glory of the kingdom of heaven, then he would abandon living as he previously did in this glory, which I have described, in favor of that kingdom of heaven which he was in before then for one night, even if he could not come again to the glory of heaven.

This is a description that parallels the earlier account of hell, as Zacher has pointed out: both descriptions play with the conceit of an excess of earthly sensory impression not equalling a single night in the other place, while Samson of the earlier passage is balanced by Solomon here.[44] Once again, the effect is achieved through excess. The homilist outdoes the Old Testament account of a land that floweth with milk and honey (from Exod. 3:8, etc) with further geographical and geological and meteorological delights presented in a heightened style. The imagined persona is placed upon a high place made of the most precious metal imaginable, a mountain of gold. It is characteristic of the homilist's dilatory style, though, to build on even this picture of excess. This is not just any old mountain of gold, *gylden mor*, but "eal smætegylden mor" (a mountain all of pure gold), and not just at any time, but at sun-rise, presumably with the full potential of a happy day in prospect, all the happier for the consonance of the glowing of the rising sun complementing the glow of the gold in the visual image, just as the matching *s*- alliteration and the chiming of nasal *m* and *n* sounds establish some formal consonance to signal a happy dawn. The imagined point of view is given the highest social standing, "swa dyre swa cynebearn" (as splendidly as a royal offspring), but without the responsibilities and burdens that would presumably accrue to being the actual *cyning*. The persona is set up as the wisest and also the most beautiful man imaginable from

[44] Zacher, *Preaching the Converted*, pp. 217–19.

available traditions, "7 hæbbe Salemanes wlite 7 wisdom" ("and he might have the beauty and wisdom of Solomon). The image continues in such unhurried fashion, holding off from reaching the syntactic climax with both aural and conceptual pyrotechnics (assonance leading to rhyme in "eal middangeard on geweald geseald" (all the world … given to his power); an allusion to the biblical idea of the ideal land with the streams flowing honey; the practical caveat of having no enemies; the expansive inclusion of knowledge and artistic sensibilities with "ealle sundercræftas 7 wuldorsangas" (all special skills and glorious songs), the latter a unique-surviving compound; the appeal to another sense with "ealle swetnesse" (all sweetness), as well as comfort and treasures; and the insistence on suspending the mortal rules of time and change and decay, "7 him þonne sy singal sumor butan ælcre onwendednesse, 7 he mote alybban butan sare" (and for him then there might be continuous summer without any change, and he might live forever without sorrow)—in what is clearly a purple passage of syntactic delight aimed at getting as close as possible to expressing the inexpressibly wonderful. In parallel with the description of hell, all this unhurried unfolding of delight gets undercut with a surprising reversal—the one who had been but one night in heaven would abandon all this imagined worldly glory, even if he could not get back to the glory of heaven, presumably because it is such a let-down by contrast with heaven.

Even as this worldly paradise will finally be undercut by comparison with the heavenly one, the homilist seems to be deploying all his verbal and conceptual inventiveness to build up this picture of happiness.[45] The homilist includes one additional element in the imagination of this Old English Land of Cockayne, namely sexual pleasure. The homilist imagines the pleasure of the arrival of a bride to the persona, who is imaged as male ("him sy

[45] Ananya Jahanara Kabir, *Paradise, Death and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, CSASE 32 (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 96–97, points to the contrast between paradise and heaven in this passage, a distinction which, she shows, is rarely maintained so clearly in Old English literature.

… bryd to bedde gelæd"). This is not simply the pleasure of marital sex but rather, in the excesses characteristic of the whole picture, the pleasure of marital sex "ælce niht" (each night). And the homilist goes one better, in this world of imagined pleasures that have already broken the rules of nature and here break the rules of society, imagining a "niwe bryd" (new bride), brought to the persona's bed each night.[46] In a final dilatory extension, the new bride is presented as the most beautiful woman imaginable. Matching the persona's *wlite* of Solomon, the new bride has the *wlite* of Juno, Saturn's daughter, a surprisingly positive presentation of the Roman goddess.[47] Part of the imagined bliss, then, of this unimaginably blissful picture is the pleasure of repeated sex with multiple partners of unimaginable beauty. It is but one element in the imagined portrait of a paradisical state, but it is striking as an unusually positive presentation of the act of sex.[48] Apparently, though, that imagination was just too heated for many preachers: this is not a moment that flowed straightforwardly into each of the manuscript witnesses.

The most extreme reaction is the one preserved in Bodley 340 (**E**), since this witness straightforwardly omits the pleasurable sex along with the whole elaborate picture of pleasure. Someone in the course of the transmission of the text to **E** apparently did not appreciate the

---

[46] Assuming this is a new woman on each occasion rather than a reiterative first night of sexual awakening, the textual tradition most likely inspiring the homilist's imagination is the uxoriousness of Solomon with his 700 wives and 300 concubines.

[47] Juno gets a more critical treatment from Ælfric, who mentions her incestuous marriage to her brother Jove in his "De Falsis Diis" (see Pope XXI, 2:682, line 114).

[48] The paucity of positive representation is discussed by Edith Whitehurst Williams, "What' s So New about the Sexual Revolution? Some Comments on Anglo-Saxon Attitudes toward Sexuality in Women based on Four Exeter Book Riddles," *Texas Quarterly* 18 (1975), 46–55, and Melanie Heyworth, "Perceptions of Marriage in *Exeter Book Riddles 20* and *61," Studia Neophilologica* 79 (2007), 171–84, both of whom find relief only in descriptions in the Exeter Book riddles. See also Magennis cited in n. 55 below.

Land of Cockayne-like imagery and so omitted this entire passage (Vercelli IX, lines 183–200). This is consistent with **E**'s omission of the seven heads and the whole din of hell passage described above (Vercelli IX, lines 151–63). **E** provides evidence of a compiler (at some earlier stage in its transmission) who did not appreciate Vercelli IX's distinctive turns toward humour and a heightened imagination. The interventions may be the result of more than one uncomfortable transmitter, since further omissions are visible within this very manuscript, where colourful words and images have been scratched out.[49] The result is a text of Vercelli IX that is significantly less exuberant than the fuller version that lies behind it, even as it still preserves many elements of the enumerative style and some of the extended similes. Both homiletic humour and sexually-charged imagination were evidently controversial elements to include in a homily and were rejected by the compilers who prepared **E**.

The key passage gets a different treatment from a compiler on the way to the version preserved in Hatton 115 (**L**). This version smoothes the syntax, as is consistently the case in **L**, but also makes a striking omission:

> Þeah smætegylden mor sy æt sunnan upgange on neorxnawonge, 7 se oferlicge ealle eorþan, 7 cynebearn sitte onufan þæm, 7 þæt sy on middre ylde,[50] 7 þeah he

[49] See above, n. 29. Additionally, an earlier account of the hell hound with one hundred heads has been marked with crosses for excision by, presumably, another reviser.

[50] **L** has erasures and corrections throughout the homily which are indicated here in view of the special interest of the passage: "-re ylde" is the work of a corrector, over-writing an original "middan" followed by half a line of text now erased that probably read "þæm ge" followed by 5–7 now illegible letters, one of which is tentatively read by Scragg as an *s*, fol. 146r/17–18.

mote sittan [oþ ende his lifes],[51] 7 he hæbbe Salomones wlite 7 his wisdom, 7 him sy eal middaneard on gewæald geseald mid þæm gestreonum þe[52] heofonas behwealfeþ, 7 him ælc stan wære gylden,[53] 7 him ealle streamas hunige flowen, 7 him þonne on eorþan nære nænig wiðerbroga, 7 þeah him sie ealle sangcræftas to gesamnode þæt hine afrefrian, 7 him sie ealle swetnessa[54] mid eaðnessum geboren, þeah nyle he on eallum þyssum wuldre gewunian gif he wæs ane niht on heofonum. (Vercelli IX [**L**], lines 160–70)

even if there were a mountain of pure gold at the rising of the sun in paradise, and it rose over all earth, and a royal offspring sat on top of it, and he was in the peak of life, and even if he might sit until the end of his life, and he had the beauty and wisdom of Solomon, and all the world was given into his power with those treasures which the heavens encompass, and for him each rock was golden, and for him all rivers flowed honey, and there were no adversaries for him then on earth, and even if all artistry in song was assembled in him that could comfort him, and all sweetness with happiness was born to him, nevertheless he would not remain in all this glory if he had been one night in heaven.

---

[51] This is Scragg's emendation, line 163 of his text. A corrector has written "aa butan ende" at the end of fol. 146r/18 and beginning of 146r/19 in place of an erasure of a third of a line (some 9–11 letters) at the beginning of 146r/19.

[52] There is an erased letter after *þe*; Scragg suggests a possible *w* in his apparatus [165 should read 164], although I think it is an *o*, possibly underdotted for erasure, fol. 146r/22.

[53] There is probably an erased letter before *gylden*, fol. 146r/23.

[54] The scribe gives the word one *s* too many at the line break: *swetnes*|*ssa*, fol. 146v/5–6.

While this is recognizably the same passage drawing on the same wording, it has become significantly less wordy and more streamlined, presumably as some preacher has prepared it for delivery with a rhythmical style and sense appropriate to himself. This preacher appears to appreciate clarity, as is most apparent here in the ending. **A** is forceful but confusing in having the privileged man reject the imagined earthly paradise as presumably not good enough for someone who has been one night in heaven, suggesting that the renunciation is not motivated by self-interest since the man would do it even if he could not get back to heaven. In **L**, the privileged man simply abandons the glories of such pleasure in light of the contrast with a single night in heaven, an abandonment not weighed down with further explanation. The earthly pleasures are substantially the same in **L** as in **A**, but with one fascinating difference. The privileged man is still elevated in paradise with the pleasure of dawn on the mountain of the world's purified wealth, is still elevated in social situation as a scion of royal birth, still elevated in looks and learning with the comparison with Solomon, still provided with power and treasures, a landscape of gold flowing honey, still free of enemies and elevated with musical accomplishments, still provided with sweetness and happiness. What is so conspicuously missing from this account of imagined earthly happiness is sex!

There are plenty of clues that this constitutes an omission from **L** rather than an addition in **A**. For a start, it is unlikely that a reviser would choose to add such a striking and controversial image and more likely that it would be censored out. Furthermore, additional groundwork is laid in **L** for the sexual image with the information that the hypothetical privileged man, even as he is a royal child (cynebearn) is, nevertheless "on middre ylde" (in middle years), clarifying, I think, that "cynebearn" is not supposed to suggest childhood, despite the *-bearn*, but rather a grown-up scion of the royal line, who might as a consequence reasonably be imagined old enough to enjoy the sex. The groundwork is thereby well laid in **L**, but we can see this preacher baulk at the idea of parading recurrent sex, even in the conditional mode, with simply no reference to the bride brought to bed. The compiler who has

shaped the version in **L** may appreciate comic effects, as seen in the handling of the earlier examples above, but is scared off by a salacious imagination—no sex, please, we're Anglo-Saxon.[55]

There is one other witness to this extended simile. Cotton Tiberius A. iii (M), which presents the devil and anchorite story as free-standing narrative and so has various differences from the other versions, is clearly presenting the same image:

> Þeah þe sie sum smetegelden dun eal mid gimmum asett æt sunnan upgange an neorxnawonge, 7 sio þanne oferhlifige ealle eorþan bradnesse, 7 þær sitte þonne sum cynebearn anufan þare gyldenan dune, 7 he sie eac anmiddan his fere fægernesse 7 his life, 7 he mote þær sittan a oþ ænde his lifes, 7 he hæbbe þonne Samsones[56] wlite 7 his wisdom 7 his wisdom,[57] 7 him sio eal middangeard an geweald gesæald mid eallum þam welum 7 þam weoruldgesreonum[58] þe heofen behwælfeþ abuton, 7 him Saturnas[59] dohtar, 7 þeah þe him ealle streamas hunige fleowan 7 him þanne an eorþan næfre nære ænig wiþerbreota[60] on þisan life, þeah[61] þe him sæon ealle wynsumnesse 7 ealle swetnesse to gehriordum forþgeborenne, 7 him þanne sie singal sumor 7 lytel winter, 7 he þone sie lange to life gescapen

---

[55] Hugh Magennis, "'No Sex Please, We're Anglo-Saxons'? Attitudes to Sexuality in Old English Prose and Poetry," *LSE* n.s. 26 (1995), 1–26, shows such hesitation towards sexual topics to be a recurring feature of surviving Anglo-Saxon literature, although without considering this example.

[56] Presumably an error for "Salomones" and so emended by Scragg.

[57] Presumably the second "7 his wisdom" is inadvertent dittography, omitted by Scragg in his text.

[58] Corrected to "weoruldgestreonum" by Scragg.

[59] Scragg adds ellipses before "Saturnas" while observing "no break in MS."

[60] Scragg corrects to "wiþerbreoga."

[61] Scragg supplies "7" before "þeah."

butan wrace 7 butan sare, 7 he þonne þeahhwæþere ne meg for sorgum þæt he on eallum þisum wuldre wunige gef he ær wære ane niht an heofonum 7 eft þider mote 7 sceawigan þær þes heofenkyninges ansione 7 þa wensumnesse þe an heofonum bioþ.

(Vercelli IX [**M**], lines 64–79, without Scragg's emendations)

even if there were a certain mountain all of pure gold all set about with gems at the rising of the sun in paradise, and it towered then over all the breadth of the earth, and a certain royal offspring might sit there then on top of that golden mountain, and he was in the middle of the passage of his beauty and of his life, and he might sit there forever until the end of his life, and he had Samson's beauty and his wisdom and his wisdom, and all the world might be given into his power with all the riches and all the worldly treasures which heaven encompasses about, and for him Saturn's daughter, and even if for him all the rivers flowed honey, and for him then there were never any adversary on earth in this life, even if all pleasure and all sweetness in language might be brought forth to him, and for him there might be then continuous summer and little winter, and he might be created for a long life without suffering and without sorrow, and nevertheless, he then could not for sorrows remain in all this glory if he were one night in heaven and might go again thither and gaze there on the countenance of the king of heaven and experience the pleasure which is in heaven.

Here the style is noticeably more verbose, with the adapter apparently augmenting words and phrases and piling on the pleasures of the idealized image, delaying the punch-line further, which itself is more extended as it imagines the vision of the king of heaven and spells out the yearning that comes from the desire to return. Giving the privileged man the looks and

wisdom of Samson is presumably a simple error for the near anagram of the so-much-more-suitable Solomon. Most fascinating here, of course, is what happens to the sex. The phrase "7 him [notice no gap here] Saturnas dohtar" (and for him Saturn's daughter) makes reasonable sense in context, assuming an oddly-spelled genitive singular in a text riddled with small errors and odd spellings.[62] Among the earthly delights imagined for the privileged man is Saturn's daughter. Who Saturn's daughter is is not spelled out, nor is a verb supplied. In context the idea would surely be that the persona is given Saturn's daughter as his wife, a hint at conjugal bliss altogether less heated than the reiterative and varied sex of the Vercelli Book, where Juno is introduced only as an image for the beauty of the repeated sexual partners. The compiler of the version in **M** introduces the idea of the pleasure of sex as one of the pleasures of this paradisical picture, but downplays this element, apparently baulking at presenting too much sex. Even as its watered-down version confirms the presence of sex in the original here, **M** provides more evidence that introducing sexual pleasure is a controversial option in a homily.

L2 Conclusion: The Joy of Transmission

Vercelli IX is like many other Anglo-Saxon homilies in invoking good Christian conduct through a threat of hell for sinners and a promise of heaven for those who are virtuous, but its strategies for achieving this invocation are at times quite unusual. Two of those distinctive elements have been explored in this essay: exaggeration in the description of hell to the extent of creating humour, both in describing the mouthpiece for the account and in conveying the din, and drawing on the bodily pleasure of sex as an image to help convey the yet-more-

[62] The text of **M** preserves some distinctive Kentish spellings, but also features many slips in spelling, as can be seen in Scragg's emendations listed in the notes above, so that a reader would presumably be willing to approximate in order to establish sense.

transcendent joy of heaven. Including either of those elements in an Anglo-Saxon homily proves to have been controversial, as can be seen in the many surviving versions that do not reproduce these effects in full but instead reflect compiler-editors who baulked in different ways at precisely these turns.

In tracing the various treatments of this homily in transmission, the version preserved in the Vercelli Book (**A**) comes to stand out in particular relief. While this is a manuscript that includes a number of errors, as Scragg's edition makes clear, it strikingly preserves a text that does not shy away from the controversial methods deployed here. **A** records the fullest version of most of the elements examined here. It lacks the account of the din of hell (lines 151–63), but this was due to the later loss of a leaf from the manuscript rather than to any omission by the compiler, as the calculation of spacing indicates.[63] **A** is also lacking the seven heads of the inexpressibility topos (lines 111–12), where the omission was made in the exemplar shared by **A** and **E**, either accidentally or by design.[64] Otherwise, the Vercelli Book preserves an account with full inclusion of the humorous elements, and the fullest account of the sexual imagination. Such toleration for unusual homiletic style is consistent with the collection as a whole, which preserves homilies that stand out for their distinct style.[65] The precise purpose and use of the manuscript, with its combined collection of homilies and poems, has been subject to much scholarly investigation. It seems most likely that it was assembled as a pious reading collection for a secular cleric, carried to Italy on a trip to Rome, and abandoned in Vercelli.[66] The homilies it contains, then, were not preached from this

[63] See above, n. 33.

[64] See above, n. 23 , and surrounding discussion.

[65] See n. 2 above. These devices give it a non-Ælfrician feel.

[66] See Éamonn Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood: Liturgical Images and the Old English Poems of the 'Dream of the Rood' Tradition*, The British Library Studies in Medieval Culture (London, 2005); Elaine Treharne, "The

particular manuscript, although it is reasonable to assume they were in active use as preaching texts where the manuscript was compiled.[67] The Vercelli Book, then, preserves access to a preaching tradition otherwise vulnerable to squeamish censorship.

Such censorship by the squeamish is evident in different ways in the rest of the manuscript tradition. CCCC 198 (**F**) presents the most extreme case. Here, a compiler, probably working at Canterbury at the beginning of the eleventh century, reproduced the collection gathered in **E**, but omitted a single relevant item: Vercelli IX.[68] In a collection mostly comprising homilies by Ælfric, a writer famed for his self-conscious restraint and care for orthodoxy, a compiler declined to include Vercelli IX, suggesting the rejection of a style at odds with what might be termed an Ælfrician aesthetic. That choice may provide a clue as to why there are so few examples of comic or colourful Old English homilies since Ælfric's works dominate the surviving homiletic record.

The compiler of Bodley 340 (**E**) made different choices and these interestingly document ambivalent reception. Here the homily was included, but it was shorn of some of its most colourful aspects. Bodley 340, along with its sister manuscript, Bodley 342, contains a full homiletic cycle, mostly comprising Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, augmented with just a few anonymous homilies, that was probably assembled at Canterbury around the beginning of

---

Form and Function of the Vercelli Book," in *Text, Image, Interpretation: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature and Its Insular Context in Honour of Éamonn Ó Carragáin*, ed. Alastair Minnis and Jane Roberts, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 18 (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 253–66; Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, eds., *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, TASS 4 (Toronto, 2009), and the studies cited in nn. 1–4 above.

[67] Scragg, "The Vercelli Homilies and Kent," in *Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. Virginia Blanton and Hélène Scheck (Tempe, 2009), pp. 369–80, articulates a convincing case for Kent, probably Canterbury.

[68] See above, n. 22 , and surrounding discussion.

the eleventh century and moved from there to Rochester.[69] Vercelli IX is included in a toned-down form that deliberately leaves out the whole din of hell passage (lines 151–63), demonstrating how this passage, with its humorous excess, violates the expectations of a preacher who prepared this text for transmission. It likewise omits the exuberant account of the joys of heaven (lines 183–200), again suggesting an unwillingness to embrace the dilatory style of excess along with the hint of a salacious imagination. **E** still includes many strikingly expansive features in its account of heaven and hell, such as the image of the souls hanging from the cliffs and the obsessive numeration. Even this much less lively homiletic style proved uncomfortable for some subsequent preachers as is demonstrated in the omissions and alterations visible on the surviving pages, which are rich in scratched out words and phrases, marks of omission, and added conventional phrases.[70] Apparently the compiler of **E** and some of the users of that manuscript were not friendly towards homiletic humour or exuberance in homiletic descriptions.

Other transmitters were more sympathetic to some aspects of the colourful style of Vercelli IX. The version preserved in Hatton 115 (**L**) is of particular interest in this regard. The homily here is only loosely associated with the book in which it is now bound since it is written as a free-standing booklet in a distinct hand of the second half of the eleventh century, ending with a blank page, and complete with a clear horizontal fold and signs of soiling that suggest it was carried around independently.[71] It thus circulated in the field on its own before

---

[69] See *VH*, p. xxvii; Clemoes, *CH* I, pp. 7–10 (for whom this pair of manuscripts has the sigel **D**); *CH* II, pp. xxv–xxviii; and my description in *Homilies by Ælfric and Other Homilies*, ASMMF 17 (Tempe, 2008), pp. 53–69.

[70] See nn. 29 and 49 above and discussion there.

[71] As described by P. R. Robinson, "Self-Contained Units in Composite Manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Period," *ASE* 7 (1978), 231–38; repr. in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings*, ed. Mary P. Richards, Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 5 (New York, 1994), pp. 25–36.

being inserted and preserved in a collection of homilies mostly by Ælfric with a later provenance of Worcester.[72] The whole homily has been subject to enough adaptation that its modern editor needs to present **L** as a parallel text, even as it clearly reproduces essentially the same underlying work. It is possible to see in the changes how one or a sequence of compilers worked over the homily giving it their own stamp before preaching the piece. Small verbal adjustments make for greater coherence—Scragg remarks that this version constitutes a "much more unified and intelligible piece" than that in **A**[73]—in an adaptation that was sensitive to the use of humour. This version preserves the full effect of the seven heads in the description of hell and elegantly captures the anti-climactic exaggeration of the din of hell, but it removes the imagined delight in sexual activity from the description of heaven, even as it looks like it is building up to that detail. Internal evidence provides additional hints for who helped shape this version since the new opening addresses priests and those responsible for the edification of lay folks, even as the bulk of the address is clearly aimed at laymen and laywomen, suggesting the piece was adapted for preaching by a bishop. Such an authoritative preaching voice was, apparently, willing to embrace humour and an exuberant style to edify his flock, but not to risk firing up their sexual imagination.

The other versions discussed here attest to the popularity of some passages for other preachers. The seven heads episode for expressing the inexpressibility of heaven gets picked up in the context of a different homily in CCCC 419 (**N**), a manuscript of the first half of the eleventh century, as part of the homily Napier XLIII. The appeal of the image is seen in looser adaptations in two further Rogationtide homilies.[74] The din of hell passage is included in

[72] See Clemoes, *CH* I, pp. 33–36; Godden, *CH* II, pp. lxvi–lxviii; Pope, pp. 53–59, who give this manuscript the sigil **P**.

[73] *VH*, p. 153.

[74] See above, nn. 24 and 25, and surrounding discussion.

Hatton 113 (**O**), of the third quarter of the eleventh century, as part of Napier XXX. CCCC 303 (**H**), of the first half of the twelfth century, probably from Rochester, represents a different fascinating case, since the devil's account to the anchorite of the torments of hell, drawn from Vercelli IX, lines 144–216 (rounded out with a couple of sentences drawn from Vercelli XIV)[75] is added as a short free-standing item within a major homiletic collection.[76] This text, rubricated *De Inclusis*, is written by one of the two main scribes and fills up eighteen lines at the end of a quire that would otherwise be blank. The writing of the last four lines shows signs of compression, indicating that the scribe was working with just this episode and fitted the piece to the space. The result is by no means a complete work for preaching but rather an exemplum that might be handy in a preaching context, probably for filling out a homily with a memorable account of the terrors of hell. Apparently, then, the authority guiding the compilation in **H** particularly appreciated the potential humour in the exaggerated description of the din of hell and recorded the episode for subsequent use.

Finally, the images for both the din of hell and the pleasure of paradise get picked up in Cotton Tiberius A. iii (**M**), of the middle of the eleventh century from Christ Church, Canterbury, albeit with a very downplayed account of the sex in the latter passage. This version is of particular interest here as it, once again, highlights appreciation for the comic and expansive homiletic style, but it is not clear whether this is a piece for preaching or a collection of anecdotes for potential use by a homilist in the manner of the extract in **H**. The piece, which occupies seventy-six lines in the manuscript (fols. 87r/31– 88v/4), lacks any homiletic opening but does include a brief passage of standard homiletic injunctions at the

[75] See *VH*, pp. 157 and 240.

[76] See *CH* I, pp. 5–7, *CH* II, pp. xxxiii–xxxvii; Pope, pp. 18–20, for whom this has the sigil **C**.

end. The lively elements of homiletic style were apparently appreciated by someone who shaped up this rather miscellaneous collection.[77]

The use of humour and attention-grabbing imaginative material is not necessarily inimical to Christian preaching traditions—it is, for example, widely discussed and sporadically practiced in the later medieval English preaching tradition—but such devices are little used in the surviving Anglo-Saxon record. Vercelli IX presents an exception to that norm. This makes it a particularly fruitful case for viewing the response of different compilers as the piece got written into different manuscripts and excerpted in different homilies—a process of study that will be greatly facilitated by the current ECHOE project. Imagining the joy of sex as a pointer toward the greater joy of heaven is a bold image that proves too much for most preachers. Humorous exaggeration appeals to some, even as it is suppressed by others. While the surviving homiletic tradition is dominated by the restrained aesthetic of Ælfric and, to a lesser extent, the explicit moralizing of Wulfstan, Vercelli IX merits careful attention as it preserves hints of an alternative way for guiding the flock in Anglo-Saxon England.

[77] See Helmut Gneuss, "Origin and Provenance of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: The Case of Cotton Tiberius A. III," in *Of the Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, their Scribes and Readers: Essays presented to M. B. Parkes*, ed. P. R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 13–48: and Tracey-Anne Cooper, *Monk-Bishops and the English Benedictine Reform Movement: Reading London, BL, Cotton Tiberius A. iii in Its Manuscript Context*, Studies and Texts 193 (Toronto, 2015).

L1 The Resonances and Roles of Vercelli Homily X in Multiple Manuscripts

Robert K. Upchurch

The anonymous author of Vercelli X created a condemnation of excess wealth and greed, and a reflection on the transience of earthly goods and glory that would resonate with compilers and preachers, and ring in the ears of audiences for over two hundred years. Written most likely in the tenth century, compiled in the Vercelli Book between 950 and 988 A.D., and copied well into the twelfth century, Vercelli X owes its popularity in part to its clever construction, imaginative dialogues, and verbal fireworks.[1] The sermon that Samantha Zacher calls "something of a marvel" must have been a thrill to preach.[2] Its survival in eight manuscripts in nine whole or partial copies—more copies than any other anonymous Old English sermon—testifies to its enduring appeal.[3] Whereas much of the previous work on the homily has focused on its sources, analogues, and style, this essay focuses on four copies in three manuscripts to identify the distinctive resonances Vercelli X generated in homiletic combinations unique to those collections.[4] Those resonances shed light on the roles the

---

[1] *VH*, pp. xxxviii–xlii and 191–95. Vercelli X was also known and discussed as Napier XLIX, a label no longer in use (see Napier, pp. 250–65).

[2] Samantha Zacher, *Preaching the Converted: The Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Book Homilies*, TASS 1 (Toronto, 2009), p. 139.

[3] *VH*, p. 191, and Donald G. Scragg, "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric," *ASE* 8 (1979), 223–77.

[4] This essay is modelled on that by Jonathan Wilcox, "The Use of Ælfric's Homilies: MSS Oxford Bodleian Library, Junius 85 and 86 in the Field," in *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan (Leiden, 2009), pp. 345–68. For a guide to the scholarship on Vercelli X, see Paul G. Remley, "The Vercelli Book and Its Texts: A Guide to Scholarship," in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, TASS 4 (Toronto, 2009), pp. 392–415.

homily putatively played when preached in various contexts: in the field by a low-status priest who carried with him Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 85/86, at a minster by a higher-status priest who preached it as part of the programme of pastoral care in CCCC 302, and at Exeter cathedral by Bishop Leofric who owned the set of homilies in CCCC 419 and 421. This approach acknowledges the utility over time of a sermon that offers ageless moral and practical remedies for age-old social and salvific problems; it likewise attends to shades of meaning created when a compiler compiled or a preacher preached the homily in the context of a particular manuscript. By identifying more distinct resonances and more precise roles for Vercelli X in these manuscripts, this chapter points to the kind of work ECHOE will encourage as it maps the compositional and conceptual aspects of not just one but all Old English anonymous homilies.

An overview of Vercelli X's themes and structure provides a frame of reference for tracking points of contact between multiple sermons in a single collection. Spurring listeners to avoid hell and earn heaven through virtuous living, the homily is fundamentally eschatological. Its opening reminder of God's benevolent redemption of mankind leads to a Doomsday scene wherein Christ condemns the disobedient to hell; its central episode features him judging and damning a greedy rich man; and a purple passage near the end points up the uselessness of wealth and worldly glory on the Last Day. The sermon is also penitential. When Christ rebukes the rich man for failing to give alms and calls the faithful to confession, penance, fasting, and prayer, the homily urges penitential behaviours that will earn believers mercy. Structurally, Vercelli X alternates between exhortation (§§ 1, 3, 5) and dramatic scenes wherein the homilist voices speeches by Satan and Christ (§§ 2, 4, 6), but references to God's mercy, judgement, and reward unite the sections to achieve its eschatological aims.

The summary below begins with the homily proper since only the version in the Vercelli Book contains "a preamble (lines 1–8) on the spiritual value of reading and listening to the Gospel"[5]:

§1 Christ's Incarnation, God's Salvation, the Believer's Avoidance of Damnation (lines 9–54)

Christ's Incarnation reconciled the world to God and opened heaven for those who act virtuously. God healed, rescued, honoured, enriched, and adorned all those to whom Christ revealed his mercy and love, and he appointed them to Paradise. Since the devil cannot deny devout Christians the heavenly kingdom, they ought to keep the faith, seek peace with God and men, and put Satan to flight by guarding against sins.

§2 The Last Judgement (lines 55–121)

Believers should fix their hearts on the will of God and consider the Last Judgement. At that time he will show no partiality to the royal or the rich, whose trappings of wealth will yield them no favours. Good deeds must outnumber misdeeds lest Satan claim those who forget the reward and turn to the devil. Satan sues for the souls of the disobedient before the throne of Judgement, and Christ condemns the wicked to hell.

§3 Imperative to Earn Mercy with Obedience and Generosity (lines 111–21)

Christians must not be reckoned among the damned but among the chosen and those who are pleasing to Christ. They must earn mercy through obedience, generosity, and caring for the disadvantaged as Christ cared for them. Then they will be beloved of God, for no deed is hidden from him.

§4 Christ's Harangue and Damnation of the Ungenerous Rich Man (lines 122–206)

[5] *VH*, p. 191. I adapt this summary from Robert Upchurch, "A Call to Alms: Ælfric's Condemnation of Hoarding in *Catholic Homily* II.7," *JEGP* 115 (2016), 413–41.

Christ's excoriates and damns an ungrateful, ungenerous rich man for his lack of charitable deeds. Christ taunts, threatens, and barrages with belligerent questions the man he deems proud, stingy, stupid, and deceived. The questions highlight the man's poor grasp on the bestowed nature of material wealth and the bestower's benevolence. The Saviour charges him with failing to give alms and damns him to death for pride, misplaced security in his excess goods, and ingratitude. God does not like anyone to be ungrateful for his gifts. The greater the gift, the greater the gratitude, for humility and generosity will merit mercy on Judgement Day.

§5 Transience of Worldly Wealth and Glory (lines 207–45)

The wealthy face great dangers, and the inexorable destruction of towering trees and lofty promontories symbolizes the inevitable death of the high-ranking. Questions calling attention to the fleeting glories and riches of emperors, kings, ruling men, and judges prompt a comparison between the sudden departure of earthly joys and the sudden parting of body and soul. The Judge's reaction to those who loved transitory riches and glory cannot be known.

§6 God's Salvation, Christ's Final Address, and the Joys of Heaven (lines 246–75)

It is better for believers to love the Lord with all their minds, strength, and understanding. Christ counsels them to gain God's mercy by confession, penance, fasting, and prayer rather than to try to gather the world into their possession, for which the devil will take their souls. Christ contrasts living in hell-torment with living in heaven with high rank and royal adornment to underscore the Christian's need to pursue what is better and turn to what is more worthy. That choice alone will secure the joys of heaven.

The earliest copy of the homily, that in the Vercelli Book, dates to the second half of the tenth century, while the latest dates to the second half of the twelfth. The nine copies survive in various forms, ranging from the full text described above (three copies), a shortened version

that begins with Christ's harangue in section four (two copies), two fragments from presumably full versions and one from an indeterminate version (three copies), and brief extracts in a composite homily (one copy). Regardless of their present form, all the copies "appear to have been written with a great deal of freedom."[6] This essay considers four of those singular representations in manuscripts dated later than the Vercelli Book that show signs of use and wherein Vercelli X shows thematic affinities with other homilies: the fragment from the indeterminate version in Junius 85/86, a full copy in CCCC 419/421, and the full and shortened versions in CCCC 302.[7] While the shortened version retains the eschatological and penitential strains of the full version, its tone is more combative since it concentrates on the failure of the rich to give alms. Vercelli X's variability in form, however, does not inhibit its versatility for preaching on different occasions in the manuscripts studied here, whether after Epiphany in anticipation of Lent, during Rogationtide, or "quando uolueris," whenever you wish.

L2 Vercelli Homily X in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 85/86

Identifying the roles and resonances of a fragmentary Vercelli X in a fragmentary mid-eleventh-century manuscript requires speculation, but either the full or the shortened version in Junius 85/86 would have regularized and intensified its warnings to the wealthy to convert

[6] *VH*, p. 193. For the differences among the various versions and the dating of the manuscripts on which this overview draws, see pp. 192–95 and xxiii–xxxv, respectively.

[7] The shortened version in London, BL, Cotton Faustina A. ix also qualifies for consideration. Due to space limitations, I analyse the earlier, closely related copy of the shortened version in CCCC 302, which, uniquely, contains the full version as well.

their temporal riches to eternal securities or lose their souls.[8] Jonathan Wilcox makes a convincing case that the small (155 × 110mm), portable book likely belonged to a low-status priest who used it to care for his flock.[9] The "incongruously scruffy, messy, materially poor, and well-used collection" begins with the final lines (about sixty words) of Vercelli X on the first leaf.[10] Five Old English homilies follow.[11] "The whole sequence," according to Wilcox, "has a clear thematic coherency centring around consideration of death and judgement and the fate of body and soul," and Vercelli X easily finds a place among homilies that offer "ample moral guidance on the need to give alms, pay tithes and the like, but mostly in the context of the big broad questions of eschatology."[12] The contents of Junius 85/86 can be summarised as follows:

> The last lines only from an indeterminable version of **Vercelli X** (Ker, no. 337, art. 1, fol. 2r);[13]
>
> An untitled homily on the fates of good and wicked souls and bodies

[8] Junius 85/86 now contains eighty folios, and begins and ends imperfectly; the two manuscripts comprised a single volume in the medieval period. See Ker, *Catalogue* , no. 337; Jonathan Wilcox, *Homilies by Ælfric and other Homilies*, ASMMF 17 (Tempe, 2008), pp. 113–28; and Gneuss/Lapidge, no. 642.

[9] "Use of Ælfric's Homilies," pp. 355–66.

[10] "Use of Ælfric's Homilies," p. 355. John N. Chadbon edits the collection in "Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Junius 85 and 86: An Edition of a Witness to the Old English Homiletic Tradition" (hereafter cited as Chadbon) (PhD diss., University of Leeds, 1993). Wilcox, "Homilies by Ælfric," pp. 124–26, lists published editions where available, as do Gneuss/Lapidge, no. 642.

[11] An incomplete set of four Latin charms (art. 3) has been interposed between the second and third sermons.

[12] "Use of Ælfric's Homilies," p. 360.

[13] Chadbon, p. 100; *VH*, p. 213, lines 270–75 (noting readings of MS **C**).

(art. 2, fol. 2v, art. 4, fols. 3r–11v, and art. 2, fols. 12r–17r);[14]

A fragmentary set of four Latin charms for a pregnant woman, pain, an unknown swelling, and a toothache (art. 3, fol. 17v);

For the first Sunday in Lent (*Dominica I in Quadragesima*), an Ælfric homily on Lenten observances, the virtue of almsgiving and vice of hoarding, and the Last Judgement (art. 5, fols. 18r–24r);[15]

An untitled homily on Lenten observances, the fates of souls and bodies, Hell, Heaven, and Judgement Day (art. 6, fols. 25r–40r);[16]

An untitled homily on tithing and almsgiving, and the duties of priests to teach and instruct (art. 7, fols. 40v–61v);[17]

[14] Chadbon, pp. 101–14. This composite homily consists of a Soul-and-Body homily (art. 2) into which has been interpolated the *Vision of St Paul* (art. 4). Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda edits the first in Fadda VIII, pp. 163–73. Antonette diPaolo Healey edits the second in *The Old English Vision of St Paul* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), pp. 63–73, and suggests the homilies have been harmonized into a single sermon (pp. 4–5). The *Vision of St Paul* has been inserted into a Soul-and-Body passage at Fadda VIII, p. 165, line 13.

[15] Chadbon, pp. 124–31; *CH* II, VII, pp. 60–66.

[16] Chadbon, pp. 134–46; Fadda I, pp. 7–31.

[17] Chadbon, pp. 156–67; *BH*, pp. 39–53 and 195. The fragment on p. 195 should be inserted before the sentence beginning “Soþ is” on p. 53, line 2 (Ker, no. 382, art. 4).

> For the feast-day of Saint Martin (November 11), an untitled homily on his life (art. 8, fols. 62r–81r).[18]

Though it is impossible to determine what form Vercelli X took in this collection, either the full or shortened version would have appealed to a compiler interested in last things and right living. The Judgement Day scene of the full version (§2) would resonate with the Doomsday separation of saints and sinners dramatized in the first Lenten homily (art. 5) and described in the second (art. 6).[19] Since both versions of Vercelli X contain Christ's harangue and damnation of the ungenerous rich man (§4), either would emphasize giving to be evidence of virtuous living, as do the Lenten homilies (arts. 5–6) and the sermon on tithing and almsgiving (art. 7).[20] Likewise, the general exhortations to the good life found at the beginning and end of Vercelli X (§§1, 6) would find parallels in every other homily in the collection, though in the final item the exhortation takes the form of the good life of Saint Martin (art. 8) whose deeds the faithful are encouraged to imitate.[21] The life of the saint, a generous, wealthy nobleman who loved serving God "very much more … than the empty joys of this world," inversely corresponds to the lives of the ungenerous rich man and those who love worldly glory and wealth in Vercelli X (§§5–6).[22]

---

[18] Chadbon, pp. 179–91; *VH*, pp. 291–308. The homily in Junius 85/86 is much closer to the copy in the Blickling manuscript (see *BH*, pp. 211–27) than that in the Vercelli Book (*VH*, p. 289).

[19] For art. 5, see *CH* II, VII, pp. 64–66, lines 129–79, and for art. 6, Fadda I, pp. 27–31, lines 262–313.

[20] For art. 5, see *CH* II, VII, pp. 61–64, lines 38–128; for art. 6, see Fadda I, pp. 7, lines 5–13, and pp. 15–17, lines 122–33; and for art. 7, see *BH*, p. 39, line 16 – p. 43, line 7, and p. 49, line 18 – p. 53, line 33 (including the fragment on p. 195 that should be inserted at line 2 on p. 53).

[21] *VH*, p. 308, lines 306–8.

[22] Chadbon, p. 179, line 15; *VH*, p. 292, lines 15–16 (with readings from Junius 85/86, Scragg's MS **C**): "mycle swiðor … ðonne þa idlan dreamas þisse worlde."

Verbal echoes complement these broad correspondences and create thematic resonances that give the collection greater coherence. For example, the phrasal repetition emphasized below builds associations that make it possible to understand both Soul-and-Body homilies as illustrations of the eternal consequences of the earthly choice presented to the audience in Vercelli X. In Vercelli X's final section (§6), Christ promises mercy for those who "'*cyrraþ* fram hyra gyltum … 7 *bote* … *doð*'" (*turn away* from their sins … and *perform* … *penance*), while the homilist advises Christians to "*wendan* to þam beteran and *gecyrran* to þam selran" (*go* toward the better and *turn* to the worthier) if they are to earn heavenly joys.[23] In the Soul-and-Body homily that follows (arts. 2/4), Christ thrice reiterates that he will have mercy on those who "*wendan* / *gecyrran* 7 *hrywe don*" (*turn* and *do penance*),[24] while an angel explains to an impious soul that its time to "*gehwyrfan* 7 *hrywe don*" (*turn* and *do penance*) has passed.[25] This homilist too closes with an exhortation to Christians "to ðam beteran *gecyrran*" (to *turn* to the better) lest devils snatch them from the joys of heaven.[26] The second Soul-and-Body homily (art. 6) does not call believers to "cyrran" or "wendan" or "gehwyrfan" (turn) from their sins or to a better path. However, its repeated commands for Christians to "doð … soðe hrewe" (do … true penance) literally echo the first Soul-and-Body homily and thematically resonate with the call in Vercelli X to "bote don" (perform penance).[27] We cannot say whether the verbal echoes and associative links are happy

[23] *VH*, pp. 212, lines 250–51, and 213, line 263, respectively. Highlights in italics throughout this article are my own.

[24] Chadbon, pp. 102, lines 20 and 39, and 103, line 62; *Vision of St Paul*, ed. Healey, pp. 63, line 8; 63 and 65, lines 27–28; and 65, line 50.

[25] Chadbon, p. 107, line 165; *Vision of St Paul*, ed. Healey, p. 71, line 137.

[26] Chadbon, p. 114, line 318; Fadda VIII, p. 173, line 116.

[27] Chadbon, p. 135, line 40; Fadda I, p. 11, line 45, whose advice to "doð…hrewe" is repeated in line 50. For the emphasis on almsgiving, see Chadbon, p. 134, lines 10–12 (Fadda I, p. 7, lines 5–14), where the homilist repeats

accidents that helped the compiler choose these sermons or that he may have noticed after the fact if at all. But read in this sequence, the Soul-and-Body homilies dramatize the consequences of the choice Vercelli X puts to the wealthy: be generous and earn the joys of heaven, or be greedy and endure the pains of hell.[28]

For the compiler, or a preacher who preached through Junius 85/86, or an audience who heard its sermons, Vercelli X would have generated its most distinctive resonances when read in conjunction with Ælfric's sermon for the First Sunday in Lent (art. 5) and the anonymous homily on tithing and almsgiving (art. 7). The grouping normalizes affronts to an implied audience of wealthy Christians and sustains criticisms of the rich that border on disdain. Had the set opened with the shortened version of Vercelli X, Christ's castigation of the rich fool would have intensified the force of the affront even more. Ælfric works from a source similar to the Vercelli homilist for Christ's harangue but has the preacher accuse wealthy people of hoarding their riches.[29] For him, the Parable of the Rich Fool (Luke 12:16–20) illustrates the fate of Anglo-Saxon hoarders, and Christ's damnation of the fool foretells his damnation of the "ungenerous" on Judgement Day, a descriptor Ælfric adds to Matthew's account of Christ's separation of the sheep from the goats.[30] The castigation of the rich in one sermon and their indictment for hoarding in the other appear to be of a piece with the disparagement of the well-to-do in the homily on tithing and almsgiving. There the rich are

---

the water-is-to-alms as fire-is-to-sins analogy (lines 11–14) found in Vercelli X (*VH*, p. 203, lines 129–33). Both are quoted below in n. 51.

[28] God, for example, rebukes the rich fool and an impious soul for being "unþancful" (unthankful) for his "goda" (benefits or goods): cf. *VH*, pp. 205–6, lines 150–76, with Chadbon, pp. 108–9, lines 188–93; *Vision of St Paul*, ed. Healey, p. 71, lines 154–60.

[29] *CH* II, VII, pp. 61–64, lines 47–112. For a comparative analysis, see Upchurch, "Call to Alms" (see above, n. 5).

[30] *CH* II, VII, p. 66, line 174 ("uncystigan"), in an otherwise faithful rendering of Matthew 25:31–46.

warned against ostentatious display, hoarding and hiding their riches, flamboyant benevolence, and squandering their wealth on those who do not love God.[31] The homily does not dramatize the judgement of the rich, but its criticism reaches a fevered pitch when the homilist declares that anyone who withholds gold, silver, and worldly goods and thereby allows the poor in the vicinity to die God will judge as a murderer.[32] In the earliest collections where they appear, these three sermons are the only texts to target the rich at length, but in Junius 85/86 verbal correspondences would have harmonized them into a distinct set making the wealthy's shortcomings and sins obvious to all.[33]

Whether described or dramatised, the failures of the wealthy to calculate the short-term costs of generosity relative to its long-term benefits may, as Wilcox infers, have elicited a knowing nod or nudge among the poor who saw but did not share the prosperity of the rich.[34] Certainly, the sermons would have provoked a range of reactions. Perhaps they just provoked the rich—especially those who belonged to the class of landed thegns who in eleventh-century England amassed "piles of pennies from their peasants, their mills, their cash crops and their renters…to pursue all the accoutrements of genteel life" and who revelled in conspicuous consumption and display.[35] Were the sermons preached on different occasions in the same village or manor church to a lord and his household, then Vercelli X would have targeted the wealthy for being greedy and slow to give, and for attempting to keep for themselves land and produce God gave to all. Ælfric's sermon censures hoarders and declares

---

[31] *BH*, pp. 195, lines 6–12 (ostentation), and 53, lines 16–20 (other accusations).

[32] *BH*, p. 53, line 7 ("myrþra"), where the homilist takes the otherwise common gold, silver, glad-rag motif to an unusual extreme; cf. *VH*, p. 52, line 4.

[33] Respectively, the Vercelli Book, Ælfric's Second Series of *Catholic Homilies*, and the Blickling Homilies.

[34] Wilcox, "Use of Ælfric's Homilies" (see above, n. 4), p. 366.

[35] Robin Fleming, "The New Wealth, the New Rich, and the New Political Style in Late Anglo-Saxon England," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 23 (2001), 18.

the source of their wealth, the land they owned, to be evil.[36] The tithing homily's sharp reproach would have identified the dolled up and decked out as spiritually endangered. Whatever their reactions might have been to this unique combination of homilies, we must imagine a man of certain mettle and undisputed zeal repeatedly returning with his scruffy little book to call the wealthy in his district to account.

L2 Vercelli Homily X in CCCC 302

CCCC 302 is unique because it contains two versions, one full and one shortened, of Vercelli X, and only in this collection does the compiler's double deployment of the homily at different seasons keep the unvirtuous rich in view for such a long span of the liturgical year. Rather than a low-status book used by a priest in the field, CCCC 302 is a high-status homiliary suitable for a priest in a minster in a city such as Canterbury or Rochester where the manuscript may have been copied at the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century.[37] Measuring 250 × 165mm, CCCC 302 is some four inches taller and two inches wider than Junius 85/86, and its 250-plus simply-formatted folios suggest a "utilitarian" codex "clearly designed with some practical use in mind."[38] Its thirty-two sermons covering occasions from Advent to Rogationtide imply use in a context where sermons were regularly preached and, if the copies of Vercelli X and other thematically-related homilies are accurate

---

[36] Wilcox draws attention to the polemic and the variant reading of "yfele" (evil) for "sylfe" (very) land (*CH* II, VII, p. 63, line 80) ("Use of Ælfric's Homilies," p. 366).

[37] For descriptions, see Ker, no. 56 (see above, n. 8), Gneuss and Lapidge, no. 86 (see above, n. 8), and *CH* II, pp. l–li.

[38] Elaine M. Treharne, "The Production and Script of Manuscripts Containing English Religious Texts in the First Half of the Twelfth Century," in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne, CSASE 30 (Cambridge, 2000), p. 39, where this description applies to several other manuscripts as well.

indications, preached to audiences that regularly included the wealthy.[39] The sequence of the shortened version of Vercelli X after Epiphany in February, Ælfric's homily featuring the rich fool during Lent in March, and the full Vercelli X during Rogationtide in May marks out the spiritual welfare of the rich as the compiler's persistent concern.[40]

L2 The Shortened Vercelli Homily X in its Post-Epiphany and Lenten Contexts

By positioning the shortened Vercelli X as the last of four post-Epiphany sermons between John the Evangelist's feast-day (27 December) and Septuagesima Sunday (around 13 February), the compiler of CCCC 302 shifts his focus to the rich as the Lenten battle for the hearts, minds, and alms of believers begins on Septuagesima. Rather than assemble a set of homilies that expound the Gospel reading of the day, he assembles the following run of post-Epiphany sermons on general themes:[41]

---

[39] CCCC 302 opens with Ælfric's *Hexameron*, a sermon on the six days of creation, but the compiler does not assign it to a specific occasion.

[40] The compiler slates Vercelli X for the fifth Sunday after Epiphany, a Sunday that points to specific years from which to reconstruct the liturgical calendars and thus the approximate dates on which the sermons were slated for delivery. Ker dates CCCC 302 to the turn of the twelfth century (s.xi/xii), so I have used as a guide the liturgical calendar for 1093 and 1104 A.D.. Two other calendars have only five Sundays after Epiphany before Septuagesima, but they date, respectively, to 1061 and 1123, and 1088 and 1150 A.D., and thus do not correspond with Ker's dating. For the calendar, see *Handbook of Dates for Students of English History*, ed. C. R. Cheney (1945; repr. Cambridge, 1996), pp. 136–37, Table 27.

[41] CCCC 302 appears to be a "selective" copy of a homiliary like that preserved in CUL Ii. 4. 6, which begins imperfectly with a fragment of a homily for the second Sunday after Epiphany and contains sermons for occasions through the Sunday after Pentecost (*CH* II, p. li; see also pp. xlv–xlvi). In CUL Ii. 4. 6, the homilies for the second, third, and fourth Sundays after Epiphany and for Septuagesima are pericope homilies. The same is true of the two post-Epiphany homilies in a related manuscript, CCCC 162 (*CH* II, p. xxxii). The non-pericope homilies in CCCC 302 appear to represent the compiler's significant departure from his exemplar(s).

For the feast-day of John the Evangelist (*De sancto iohanne euangelista*), an account of the saint's life and death (Ker, no. 56, art. 8, pp. 57–66);[42]

For the second Sunday after Epiphany, *Be ðere halgan clænnesse* (Concerning holy purity), Ælfric's apology concerning virginity as it applies to the clergy and laity (art. 9, pp. 66–71);[43]

For the third Sunday after Epiphany or "quando uolueris." *Be heofonwarum and be helwarum* (Concerning heaven-dwellers and concerning hell-dwellers), an eschatological homily featuring scenes of the Judgement and the afterlife in Hell (art. 10, pp. 71–73);[44]

For the fourth Sunday after Epiphany or "quando uolueris," *Be urum drihtene* (Concerning our Lord), an eschatological homily featuring scenes of the Judgement and the afterlife in Hell, as well as addresses of souls to their bodies (art. 11, pp. 73–78);[45]

For the fifth Sunday after Epiphany or "quando uolueris," *De uerbis domini* (Concerning the words of the Lord), **the shortened version of Vercelli X**

[42] *CH* I, IV, pp. 206–16.

[43] Assmann, pp. 13–23.

[44] Tolliver C. Callison, "An Edition of Previously Unpublished Homilies in MSS CCCC 302 and Cotton Faustina A. ix" (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1973), pp. 243–48.

[45] Assmann XIV, pp. 164–69.

(art. 12, pp. 78–83);[46]

For Septuagesima Sunday (*Dominica in septuagesima*), an Ælfric homily expounding the Parable of the Vineyard (Mt. 20:1–16) and briefly discussing the meaning and observance of Septuagesima (art. 13, pp. 83–90).[47]

For this singular sequence wherein Vercelli X serves as a bookend to the hagiographic homily and a pivot toward the approaching season of Lent, the compiler appears to take his cues from the *Life of St John* (art. 8).[48] The *Life*'s mention of John's virginity explains the presence of *Be ðere halgan clænnesse* (art. 9), but the compiler seems particularly responsive to its miracle-filled account of two rich brothers who give away all their wealth, regret doing so, and repent of their regret after being rebuked by John for coveting worldly riches rather than heavenly ones.[49] The two eschatological homilies (arts. 10–11) develop the theme of the fate

[46] *VH*, pp. 203 (line 122) – 213, noting readings of Scragg's MS **k** and omitting lines 203–4 and 206–19.

[47] *CH* II, V, pp. 41–51.

[48] The homily for Saint Stephen's feast-day (26 December), which precedes the *Life*, looks back to Christmas the day before (*CH* I, III, p. 205, lines 195–202).

[49] The *Life* opens with an overview of John's roles in the Gospels (lines 1–20), one of which is as "Cristes dyrling…for ðære clænnyse his ansundan mægðhades" (Christ's beloved…on account of the purity of his uncorrupted virginity; *CH* I, IV, p. 206, lines 5–6). In *Be ðere halgan clænnesse*, John serves as one of the opening proofs that Christ loves "halgan clænnysse" (holy purity; line 14) because the apostle was pleasing to God and beloved of Christ "for þære clænnysse" (on account of the purity, line 27) and the "clæne mægðhade" (pure virginity; line 14) in which he lived (Assmann XIV, pp. 13–14). The episode involving the rich brothers (lines 45–173) belongs to the account of John's persecution and exile, his return to Ephesus, and his miracle-working there and in Pergamum (lines 21–173). The remainder of the homily treats John's writing of the fourth Gospel (lines 174–93), his confrontation with and conversion of pagans who opposed the gospel (lines 195–

of the soul briefly illustrated in the *Life* when a resurrected man relates his vision from the afterlife.[50] His report that the brothers' guardian angels wept and the devil rejoiced because they had forfeited the pleasures of heaven for the torments of hell leads them to repentance and thus back to God's grace and mercy. Their restoration illustrates in brief the overarching objective of both eschatological homilies. Christ's rebuke of the rich ingrate in the shortened Vercelli X (art. 12) corresponds to John's rebuke of the rich brothers and creates the impression that the compiler viewed the homilies as bookends.[51] Both sermons focus on the necessity for the rich to convert earthly wealth into eternal securities; both threaten damnation to spur the wealthy to calculate the moral equation correctly.[52] The fool's condemnation illustrates the fate John warns the brothers against, while they model the turn to God that Vercelli X recommends.

Even though the *Life* does not mention almsgiving, the compiler's choice of homilies gradually brings the matter from the periphery to the centre as he moves toward Septuagesima Sunday. *Be heofonwarum and be helwarum* (art. 10) is the first post-Epiphany homily to broach the topic when it abruptly concludes with the water-is-to-alms as fire-is-to-sins analogy that Christ makes at the outset of the shortened Vercelli X.[53] Despite the abruptness,

---

242), and his death (lines 243–84). This summary draws on Malcolm Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, EETS s.s. 18 (Oxford, 2000), pp. 28–29.

[50] *CH* I, IV, p. 211, lines 148–53.

[51] Cf. *VH*, pp. 203–8, lines 122–96, and *CH* I, IV, pp. 209–10, lines 95–128.

[52] Cf. *CH* I, IV, pp. 209–10, lines 95–108, and *VH* (see above, n. 1), pp. 204, lines 141–44 (damnation) and 212, lines 254–56 (temporal versus eternal riches).

[53] Callison, "An Edition of Previously Unpublished Homilies," p. 248, lines 86–88: "We gehyrdan eac on bocum secgan, 'Ealswa wæter adwæsceð fyr, swa mæg seo ælmesse adwæscan þa synna'" (We have also heard it said in books, 'Just as water extinguishes fire, almsgiving is able to extinguish sins'). Cf. *VH*, p. 203, lines 129–33 (with readings from CCCC 302, Scragg's MS **k**): "Efne hit bið gelic þe man mid wætere þone weallendan lig

the causality between almsgiving and the avoidance of hell's torments, which the homilist describes in detail, is clear: "Let us give our alms generously for our sins in God's name. He will give us everlasting life in heaven without end, Amen."[54] Rather than at its end, the Judgement Day homily, *Be urum drihtene* (art. 11), initiates the theme of almsgiving at its outset, identifying prayer and almsgiving as deeds that are true and right.[55] A subsequent promise of mercy and heavenly mirth for the "ælmesfullan" (the liberal in almsgiving) leads the homilist to encourage the audience to "secgan … þanc" for God's "gifena" (give thanks for God's gifts) and to "þancian" (thank) him with all their might.[56] Such gratitude stands in stark contrast to the ingratitude of the rich fool in Vercelli X (art. 12) whom Christ damns for being "swa unþancful" (so ungrateful) for his goods and gifts because God does not want "þæt his gifena man þanc nyte" (a person to feel no gratitude for his gifts).[57] The apposition of the fool's damnation and the salvation of those who give, repent, fast, and pray extends the contrast between the avaricious and "ælmesfullan" to Septuagesima (art. 13) when Christians take up such virtuous behaviours for the "spiritual battle" of Lent.[58]

---

ofgeote þæt he leng ne mote rixian, swa þonne man mid ælmyssan ealle alyseð his gyltas 7 his synna gehæleð" (Likewise, it is just as one quenches with water the surging fire that he could no longer control when a man completely redeems his transgressions with almsgiving and heals his sins).

[54] Callison, "An Edition of Previously Unpublished Homilies," p. 248, lines 87–90: "Syllan we ure ælmessan rumheortlice for urum synnum on godes naman. He us syllð ece life on heofonum a butan ende, Amen." For the descriptions of hell, see pp. 245–47, lines 45–71.

[55] Assmann XIV, p. 164, lines 5–6.

[56] Assmann XIV, p. 166, lines 61 and 66–69, respectively.

[57] *VH*, pp. 205, line 150, and 208, line 201.

[58] The sermon characterizes the period between Septuagesima and Easter as a "gastlic gefeoht" (a spiritual battle), and "gecamp" (warfare) (*CH* II, V, p. 50, lines 259 and 268, respectively). Likewise, in the *Life* "gecamp" describes the warfare the faithful endure when they despise temporary possessions to own everlasting riches (*CH* I, IV, p. 209, line 101).

This sequence of homilies insures that John's reproach of the rich brothers (art. 8) and Christ's rebuke of the rich ingrate (art. 12) would reverberate when the wealthy come into view again in sermons for Ash Wednesday (art. 17) and the following Monday (art. 19). At the time CCCC 302 was written, Ash Wednesday fell just over two weeks after the compiler slated Vercelli X (art. 12) to be preached. The rich are not the primary target audience of Ælfric's Ash Wednesday homily, all believers are, but the sermon focuses for a time on the "welig" (wealthy) who imprudently would give "much treasure" and "countless coins" to purchase earthly ease, serenity, and security.[59] Whether by serendipity or design, the compiler's choice of this sermon for Ash Wednesday creates not just thematic overlap but verbal resonances with Vercelli X, whose "welig" man Christ questions about trusting in the "excess of his goods" and in his "money" and "possessions."[60] The questions asked of the rich in the two sermons differ, but the problem is the same. The Ash Wednesday sermon only makes explicit the remedy implicit in Vercelli X when it asks why the rich man "does not desire in this wretched life to purchase everlasting joy with good merits and with acts of almsgiving."[61]

In the homily for the Monday after Ash Wednesday (art. 19), the reappearance of the "welig" man as the protagonist of the Parable of the Rich Fool (Luke 12:16–20) marks out the wealthy as the compiler's persistent concern.[62] Faced with surplus crops and a lack of room to

---

[59] *LS*, 1:260–82, at p. 268, lines 100–1: "mycelne scet" and "ungerim feos," respectively. The sermon focuses on the "welig" on pp. 268–270, lines 100–40, at line 100.

[60] *VH*, p. 207, lines 181 ("welig"), 188 ("oferflownes … goda"), and 191–92 ("speda" and "æhta").

[61] *LS*, p. 268, lines 112–14: "nele … gebycgan on þysum earmum life þa ecean myrhðe mid godum geearnungum and ælmysdædum."

[62] *CH* II, VII, p. 63, line 90. This sermon is slated for the first Sunday in Lent in Junius 85/86 (see above, p. 000, art. 5), but since the CCCC 302 Ash Wednesday sermon (art. 17) advises Christians to go to confession either

store them, the rich man plans to tear down his existing barns and build bigger ones. His mistake, reiterated twice, is to gather "all" of his crops into his new barns and to equate his excess goods with a guarantee of future security.[63] And so, for the second time in four weeks, God requires of the fool his life, the repetition of which amplifies the sorry fate of the stingy man's soul.[64] As do the post-Epiphany eschatological sermons (arts. 10–11), the Monday homily makes clear that Lenten tithes and alms carry eternal implications: "How are we able to hide our gold hoard in heaven except through alms? Whatever we give one-fold to God's poor on account of his love, he will repay us a hundredfold in the future life."[65] The sermon's final Judgement Day scene wherein the ungenerous are damned and the righteous are saved keeps the focus on the wealthy who must give to gain their souls.

L2 Vercelli Homily X in its Rogationtide Context

The rich in goods who must become rich in God return after Easter when the compiler slates the full version of Vercelli X for preaching on Tuesday of Rogationtide, the second of three days of penance prior to Ascension Thursday. Eschatological like Lent, Rogationtide emphasizes the need for purification before Ascension when believers were to choose

---

the week of Ash Wednesday or the following week (*LS*, p. 283, lines 291–92), the compiler must have been confident that the homily (*CH* II, VII, pp. 60–66) would hit its mark on Monday.

[63] *CH* II, VII, p. 63, lines 92 and 94 ("ealle"). Ælfric adds the first "ealle" to his translation of Luke 12:17 (Godden, *Commentary* [see above, n. 48], p. 397, n. on lines 87–99).

[64] The homily also calls out acquisitive Anglo-Saxons by applying the parable to them: "Swa bið se ðe him sylfum gold hordað 7 nis on gode welig" (So will he be who hoards gold for himself and is not wealthy in God, *CH* II, VII, p. 63, lines 98–99).

[65] *CH* II, VII, p. 64, lines 109–12: "Hu mage we urne goldhord on heofonum behydan. buton ðurh ælmessan; Swa hwæt swa we be anfealdan godes þearfum for his lufan syllað, he hit us forgylt be hundfealdum on ðam toweardan life."

between "join[ing] Christ's elevation of humanity to heaven or falling under…divine punishment."[66] Preparing for Ascension, then, was tantamount to preparing for life after death, and purification involved almsgiving, fasting, prayer, vigils, and, distinctive to Rogationtide, processing with relics. The inclusion of Vercelli X indicates that the compiler expected the rich to be among the crowds marching barefoot from church to church.

With its theme of liberality rooted in divine love, the full version of Vercelli X reinforces the season's eschatological and penitential emphases. Its Last Judgement scene wherein the devil successfully sues for the souls of the disobedient (§2) provides a counterweight to Christ's promise of the joys of heaven for the observant at the sermon's end (§6). The Christian's need to avoid being reckoned among the damned highlights the imperative to earn God's mercy through obedience, generosity, and kindness to the needy (§3) and through confession, penance, fasting, and prayer (§6). The assurance that the devil cannot deny obedient believers the pathways and gates to heaven that Christ opened for them (§1) articulates the central truth celebrated on Ascension Thursday.[67]

Not only does Vercelli X display an affinity with the themes of Rogationtide, but it also works with one of the three homilies for Monday to reinforce differences between virtuous and unvirtuous rich Christians. Although the run of Rogationtide homilies is incomplete in CCCC 302 (only those for Monday and Tuesday survive), because the compiler independently arranges the sequence, the complementarity of the first sermons for Monday and Tuesday seems deliberate.[68] No two sermons slated for different days in the sequence

---

[66] M. Bradford Bedingfield, *The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2002), p. 197.

[67] *VH*, p. 198, lines 40–44.

[68] CCCC 302 does not duplicate any of the Rogationtide sermons in CUL Ii. 4. 6 or CCCC 162 (see above, n. 40).

below show more thematic overlap than the Ælfric sermon that discusses goods and goodness, and the interdependence of rich and poor (art. 30) and Vercelli X (art. 33):

> For Monday, a Sermon on the Greater Litany (*Sermo in Letania Maiora* [*sic*]), Ælfric's exposition of Jesus's teachings about prayer, an explanation of Rogationtide and its origins, and discussions of goods and goodness, and the interdependence of rich and poor (Ker, no. 56, art. 30, pp. 198–205);[69]
>
> For Monday of the Greater Litany (*Feria II in Letania Maiore*), a general sermon comprised of admonitions to obey God's commands, attend the procession of relics, fast, give alms, pray, and render dues (art. 31, pp. 205–13);[70]
>
> For the same day, On the Lord's Prayer (*Eodem die De Dominica Oratione*), Ælfric's exegesis of this prayer (art. 32, pp. 213–21);[71]
>
> For Tuesday of the Greater Litany (*Feria III in Letania Maiore*), **the full version of Vercelli X** (art. 33, pp. 221–30);[72]
>
> For the same day, On the Catholic Faith (*Eodem die de fide catholica*), a general sermon by Ælfric on the Creed, the nature of God, and the Trinity, only the first third of which survives (art. 34, pp. 230–32).[73]

[69] *CH* I, XVIII, pp. 317–24.

[70] Bazire-Cross V, pp. 70–74.

[71] *CH* I, XIX, pp. 325–34.

[72] *VH*, pp. 196–213 (noting readings of MS **K**).

[73] *CH* I, XX, pp. 335–44, lines 1–99 only.

As was true for John's *Life* and the shortened Vercelli X earlier in the year, the full version for Tuesday concentrates on an element addressed more briefly in Ælfric's homily for Monday. Verbal parallels between the homilies are few, but Monday's discussion of goods and goodness, and the obligations of the rich to the poor, pairs well with Tuesday's depiction of a rich man who has goods but is not good, and who ignores his duty to those less fortunate.[74] For example, of those who possess gold, land, and wealth, Ælfric observes that "the person is not good on account of his things unless he works good with them," namely by distributing to the poor.[75] By diminishing his money, "what he must leave," he increases his righteousness, "which he will have forever."[76] The rich have a duty to share the "heavy burden" of their wealth with their poor fellow wayfarers along life's journey, lest greed "sink them into perdition."[77] Though Vercelli X does not consider how rich and poor are necessary to each other, were it to have been preached on Tuesday, the disparity between the righteous distributor and the stingy ingrate would have been all the more glaring. The divergence between the approbation of the virtuous rich man and the condemnation of the unvirtuous rich fool would have been all the more jarring. And the divergence between the promise of heavenly riches for the distributors and the peril of those who amass worldly wealth and glory would have been all the more stark.

---

[74] *CH* I, XVIII, pp. 323–24, lines 165–213.

[75] *CH* I, XVIII, p. 323, lines 167–68: "ne bið se man god þurh þas þing, buton he mid þam god wyrce."

[76] *CH* I, XVIII, p. 323, lines 170–72: "He gewanode his feoh, 7 geyht þæt his ryhtwisnysse; he gewanode þæt he forlætan sceal, 7 þæt bið geyht þæt ðæt he habban sceal on ecnysse" (He diminished his money, and that increased his righteousness; he diminished what he must leave, and that which he will have forever will be increased).

[77] *CH* I, XVIII, pp. 323, line 175 ("swære byrðene"), and 324, line 196 ("hi besencað on forwyrde").

Since we do not know where CCCC 302 was housed, it is difficult to infer who preached to the wealthy in this way, but the homilies above testify to the compiler's expectation that the rich would regularly comprise the audience on major and minor occasions for preaching. We also know that around the turn of the twelfth century when the manuscript was written, commercialization and widening access to money in England were creating greater wealth and greater numbers of the wealthy.[78] Of course, the spiritual dangers posed by earthly wealth and the moral formula for computing its heavenly value are not unique to this time. But the compiler's concern with such issues is. His deployment of Vercelli X near the outset of Lent in early February and in the middle of Rogationtide in late May sustains his prominent focus and crystallizes this most prominent theme. The homily's role in creating such rich resonances across liturgical seasons and among so many homilies in a single collection remains unparalleled.

L2 Vercelli Homily X in CCCC 419 and 421

Like CCCC 302, the companion volumes in CCCC 419 and 421 comprise a set of homilies suitable for a high-status priest, but because the manuscripts belonged to Leofric, bishop of Exeter from 1050 to 1072 A.D., they provide an opportunity to reconstruct an audience for Vercelli X at a specific time and place. Measuring ca. 205 × 125mm, CCCC 419 and 421 are taller than Junius 85/86 and shorter than CCCC 302 by some 50 mm, but neither volume shows the wear and tear of having been carried about.[79] Although both volumes belonged to Leofric, they were written elsewhere in the first half of the eleventh century, perhaps at Canterbury, where a scribe copied the fifteen homilies in CCCC 419 and eight others in

[78] Fleming, "New Wealth" (see above, n. 35), 1–3 and 15–18.

[79] For descriptions, see Ker, *Catalogue*, nos. 68 and 69 (see above, n. 8), Gneuss/Lapidge, nos. 108 and 109 (see above, n. 8), and *CH* I, pp. 46–48.

CCCC 421 (arts. 6–9 and 12–15), including the full version of Vercelli X. In the third quarter of the eleventh century, while Leofric was bishop, two, perhaps three, Exeter scribes added seven more sermons to CCCC 421: one for Pentecost (art. 1), four for the Common of the Saints (arts. 2–5), one "larspell" (instructive discourse) addressed to the royal court (art. 10), and one untitled eschatological sermon on national disasters and national sin (art. 11). Because Leofric actively participated in supplementing manuscripts at Exeter, he likely supervised the additions.[80] Moreover, because he was also remembered as a man who "zealously preached God's word to the people entrusted to him," the investment of time, labour, and material to augment the collection suggests the bishop intended to deliver the sermons he inherited and had added to his book.[81]

The full version of Vercelli X (CCCC 421, art. 9) fitted easily into the original set of homilies, couching as it does moral guidance on giving in an eschatological framework. An Ælfric sermon on Church festivals (CCCC 421, art. 6), for example, contains a long meditation on the fate of men's souls and, like Vercelli X, teaches that those "with almsgiving merited from God the heavenly abode and eternal glory," while those "who did no good as honour to God and gave no alms" are "doomed with the devil to hell."[82] The vitriol the Vercelli Christ hurls at the rich fool echoes that of the combative Christ in two so-called

[80] See Elaine Treharne, "Producing a Library in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Exeter, 1050–1072," *RES* n.s. 54 (2003): 155–72, and Joyce Hill, "Two Anglo-Saxon Bishops at Work: Wulfstan, Leofric and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 190," in *Patterns of Episcopal Power: Bishops in Tenth and Eleventh Century Western Europe*, ed. Ludger Körntgen and Dominik Wassenhoven (Berlin, 2011), pp. 145–61.

[81] This quotation belongs to Leofric's obituary in *The Leofric Missal*, ed. Nicholas Orchard, Henry Bradshaw Society 113–14 (London, 2002), 2:4: "populo sibi commisso uerbum dei studiose predicabat."

[82] Pope, 1:415–47, at pp. 435–36, lines 367–68 and 381–83, respectively: "mid ælmysdædum geearnodon æt Gode þa heofonlican wununge and þæt ece wuldor" and "ne dydon nan god Gode to wurðmynte, ne nane ælmessan … gedemed mid þam deofle to helle."

Sunday Letters (CCCC 419, arts. 2–3) who promises hell on earth and after death for those who fail to observe the Sabbath properly, which includes paying their tithes and dues.[83] Much in the way Vercelli X issues a call to virtuous action as a response to the mercy of Christ's Incarnation, the Wulfstan sermon on observant Christian living (CCCC 419, art. 10) opens with a reflection on the debt believers owe to Christ for his sacrifice.[84] Among the ways to repay their Saviour, they can give alms and pay tithes and dues, a point the homily drives home by interposing an excursus on the tortures of hell between lists of their obligations.[85]

The sermon to the royal court added at Exeter (CCCC 421, art. 10) also urges the payment of tithes and church dues, and its placement following Vercelli X (art. 9) provides an opportunity to imagine Leofric preaching both sermons to the richest, most powerful people

---

[83] For Christ's speech in CCCC 419, arts. 2 and 3, see *Sunday Observance and the Sunday Letter in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. and trans. Dorothy Haines, Anglo-Saxon Texts 8 (Cambridge, 2010), Letter E, pp. 150–52, lines 43–81, and Letter B, p. 124, lines 115–25, respectively. See Pelle above, p. 000.

[84] Napier XXI–XXIV (see above, n. 1), pp. 111–22.

[85] Napier XXI, p. 111, lines 4–15 (opening reflection) and Napier XXII, pp. 113, line 2 – 117, line 3 (obligations and punishments). As Haines points out (*Sunday Observance*, pp. 91–93), passages in the composite homily (art. 10) correspond to those in one of the Sunday Letters (art. 2): cf. CCCC 419, art. 10 (Napier XXII, pp. 113, line 14 – 114, line 12, and Napier XXIII, pp. 116, line 1 – 119, line 11) and CCCC 419, art. 2 (Letter E, pp. 150–52, lines 56–98). These shared resonances and the presence of five other homilies that discuss or mention almsgiving and/or tithing as a necessity for leading a virtuous life underscore Vercelli X as a fitting choice for the compiler: (1) CCCC 419, art. 9 (*The Homilies of Wulfstan*, ed. Dorothy Bethurum [Oxford, 1957], no. Xc, pp. 205, lines 107–8, and 206, lines 122–24); (2) CCCC 419, art. 11 (Napier XLVI, pp. 237, line 27 – 241, line 13); (3) CCCC 419, art. 13 (Belfour, pp. 50–58, at pp. 56, line 3 – 58, line 9); (4) CCCC 419, art. 14 (Assmann XI, pp. 141–42, lines 79–97); and (5) CCCC 419, art. 15, a composite homily, the relevant part of which is edited in Pope, 2:805–808, lines 29–114. For the four texts comprising the composite homily, see Pope, 2:799–801.

in the kingdom, some of whom we can name.[86] As a former royal clerk, chaplain and friend of King Edward, and de facto member of his group of councillors, Leofric might have been asked to address the court at one of its meetings.[87] He would surely have done so in 1050 when the king and his councillors gathered with their retinues in Exeter to confirm the city as his new see.[88] The charter issued for the occasion records the presence of the king and queen, the archbishops of Canterbury and York, five bishops, three abbots, seven earls, and about a dozen thegns, so Wulfstan's sermon "On Justice, Virtue, and the Law" added to CCCC 421 (art. 10) would have been fitting for Leofric to preach.[89] The sermon opens with an address to "ure cynehlaford" (our royal lord) and later refers to the "wytan" (the councillors) whose

[86] Napier L, p. 272, lines 6–12.

[87] Frank Barlow, "Leofric and his Times," in *Leofric of Exeter: Essays in Commemoration of the Foundation of Exeter Cathedral Library in A.D. 1072*, ed. Barlow et al. (Exeter, 1972), pp. 1–14, and Barlow, "Leofric." In: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Published online September 23, 2004. DOI: 10.1093/ref:odnb/16471. Charter attestations indicate that Leofric assembled with the 'witan' over a dozen times during Edward's reign (Simon Keynes, "Table LXXII: Attestations of bishops during the reign of King Edward the Confessor," in *An Atlas of Attestations in Anglo-Saxon Charters, c. 670–1066*, ASNC Guides, Texts, and Studies [Cambridge, 2002]).

[88] Elaine Treharne surmises that Leofric may have adapted the *Promissio regis*, a coronation oath accompanied by a brief commentary on the duties of kingship, for preaching to the king and people at this time ("The Bishop's Book: Leofric's Homiliary and Eleventh-Century Exeter," in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, ed. Stephen Baxter et al. [Farnham, 2009], pp. 535–37).

[89] P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography* (London, 1968), here cited from the 'Electronic Sawyer' (available at www.esawyer.org.uk), no. 1021, ptd. in *Councils and Synods with Other Documents relating to The English Church, I: A.D. 871–1204,* ed. D. Whitelock, M. Brett, and C. N. L. Brooke, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1981), Part I: *871–1066*, ed. Whitelock, no. 71, pp. 525–33. For the sermon, see Napier L, pp. 266–74. The editorial title, "On Justice, Virtue, and the Law," is that of Andrew Rabin who translates the homily in his *Political Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan of York*, Manchester Medieval Sources (Manchester, 2014), pp. 145–53.

wisdom the king is urged to seek.[90] The homilist then calls to account the "eorlan and heretogan, deman and gerefan" (noblemen and military leaders, judges and royal officers) for their wickedness and urges them to be just and virtuous, after which he calls the clergy, "biscopas and abbodas" (bishops and abbots) first among them, to live according to their rules.[91] The sermon that Wulfstan wrote for Cnut and his councillors around 1018 would require little alteration for Leofric to deliver it to Edward and his "witan" some thirty years later.[92] Had the Exeter scribe intended Leofric to preach as a single sermon "On Justice, Virtue, and the Law" (art. 10) and the eschatological homily of Wulfstan that follows it (art. 11), then Vercelli X (art. 9) makes an even more suitable pairing as an eschatological sermon addressed to the wealthy and powerful gathered for the confirmation ceremony.[93]

The presence there of five members of England's preeminent family enables us to imagine in some detail the wealth of the personages who might have comprised an audience for Vercelli X. Godwine, Earl of Wessex, and his three sons, Swein, Harold, and Tostig, were on hand for the occasion, as was his daughter Queen Edith, who with King Edward

---

[90] Napier L, p. 266, line 1.

[91] Napier L, pp. 267, lines 25–26, and 269, lines 1–2, respectively.

[92] Rabin, *Political Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan*, p. 143.

[93] For art. 11, see *Homilies of Wulfstan*, ed. Bethurum, no. III, pp. 123–27. Art. 11 has no title in CCCC 421 (Ker, no. 69), and Joyce Tally Lionarons suggests that the Exeter scribe who copied both items intended them to be read as a single sermon (*The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan: A Critical Study* [Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2010], pp. 172–73). When first copied at Exeter, the single gathering containing arts. 10 and 11 followed the five sermons now positioned at the beginning of CCCC 421. The single gathering was later moved some two-thirds of the way into the collection to follow Vercelli X. It is not clear when the additions were separated into two units, but examples of Leofric's scribes augmenting manuscripts and placing homilies within them make it plausible and probable that the relocation occurred at Exeter (Hill, "Two Anglo-Saxon Bishops" [see above, n. 80], pp. 151–60).

accompanied Leofric to his new seat at the ceremony.[94] It is difficult to imagine that Gytha, the children's mother and Godwine's wife, did not attend, especially since the family maintained a residence in Exeter.[95] The family's pre-eminence accounts for its prominence in the historical record, which registers the Godwinesons' staggering wealth as well as their habits of displaying it. In 1065, for example, the family held more land than the king and nearly seventy-five percent of the land controlled by the families of England's most powerful earls, the other two of whom, Siward of Northumbria and Leofric of Mercia, also attended the ceremony.[96] At a time when an annual income of 240 pennies provided enough disposable income for modest thegns to indulge in luxury goods like "stone for a church, fancy shoes, or herring," the Godwinesons land generated revenues of over 2,000,000 pennies per year.[97]

Expressions of their immense wealth took various forms. The earl and his sons would likely have arrived in Exeter sporting gold arm-rings and carrying gilt armaments like those Godwine supplied to the soldiers of Edward's predecessor, Harthacnut.[98] If such gold ornamentation was all the fashion, then so too were sumptuous garments trimmed in gold. Robin Fleming encourages us to imagine the Godwinesons "dressed like peacocks, kitting themselves out, on important occasions, in loud, shiny get-ups, dressing in robes decorated with elephants or wildcats, and sporting garish tunics banded with gold-embroidered trim."[99]

---

[94] Barlow, "Leofric and his Times," p. 9.

[95] Ann Williams, "Godwine [Godwin], earl of Wessex (d. 1053), magnate." In: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Published online September 23, 2004. DOI: 10.1093/ref:odnb/10887.

[96] Robin Fleming, *Kings and Lords in Conquest England*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 227 and 225.

[97] Fleming, "New Wealth" (see above, n. 35), 16–17, at 17.

[98] Fleming, "New Wealth," 20, and C. R. Dodwell, *Anglo-Saxon Art: A New Perspective* (Ithaca, 1982), p. 30.

[99] Robin Fleming, "Acquiring, Flaunting, and Destroying Silk in Late Anglo-Saxon England," *EME* 15 (2007), 127.

Donning such outfits, they imitated their king, who wore elaborate robes and silk garments embroidered with precious stones, gems, pearls, and gold.[100] Were Edward to have carried his gold and gem-encrusted walking stick or ridden his horse with its saddle and tack sporting miniature beasts and birds of gold through the streets of Exeter to visit his father-in-law's hall, the king and his retinue would have literally shimmered with wealth while on the way.[101] They would have arrived at a compound likely to have been full of silver-gilt and gilded furnishings complemented by costly seat-covers, carpets, and wall-hangings.[102] With such opulence in mind, it bears pointing out that only wealthy men like the Godwinesons could afford the nearly 1500-penny fine for failing to render their church dues on time, an obligation about which Leofric would remind them in "On Justice, Virtue, and the Law."[103]

The bishop would have further proved his authenticity as a *pastor* (shepherd) and mettle as a preacher had he delivered to these men, their households, and the prosperous citizens of Exeter the castigation of wealth and worldly glory that is Vercelli X. Like those in the homily assembled for final judgement, King Edward possessed a resplendent "throne adorned with majesty," and he and his courtiers the "golden rings," "gold-head bands of women," and "worldly wealth" that will yield them no favours on Doomsday.[104] Like the rich ingrate, these families possessed vast amounts of hereditary "book-land" and large manorial

---

[100] Fleming, "Acquiring, Flaunting, and Destroying Silk," 138–39, and Dodwell, *Anglo-Saxon Art*, p. 179.

[101] Frank Barlow, "Edward [St Edward; known as Edward the Confessor]." In: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Published online May 25, 2006. DOI: 10.1093/ref:odnb/8516.

[102] Dodwell, *Anglo-Saxon Art*, pp. 193 (furnishings) and 38 (fabrics).

[103] Napier L, p. 272, lines 10–12. I have converted to pennies the 120 shillings mentioned in line 12.

[104] *VH*, p. 199, line 59 ("setl þrymmum gefrætewod") and lines 60–61 ("gyldene beagas," "wifa heafodgold" and "woruldgestreon"). CCCC 302's reading of 'wifa heafodgold' rather than 'heafodgold' (crown; line 61) widens the connotation from the royal to the rich, and rich noblewomen at that (*VH*, p. 437).

compounds that included "a hall and buildings."[105] All owned an "excess" of goods in which the rich fool fatefully trusted, and like the socially prominent doomed for destruction, this group held "the high station" that exposed them to danger on account of their "worldly possessions."[106] They would have seen themselves reflected in the homilist's description of the spiritually endangered decked out in "fine garments of the deepest reddish-purple," "the brightest gold," and "the most precious gems."[107] They certainly belonged to the ranks of the "rich," the "kings," the "ruling men," and the "judges," whose wealth and power would pass away.[108]

If Leofric, good shepherd that he was, preached Vercelli X, then he would have reminded the super-rich, rich, and moderately rich alike of the bestowed nature of material wealth and the benevolence of the bestower. We do well to remember that in addition to the illustrious visitors to Exeter, the city was inhabited by local guildsmen prosperous enough to be charged a thirty-penny fine for insulting another member, rich moneyers who struck coins from bullion at interest, and well-to-do merchants who profited from bustling markets full of foreign traders, all of whom had "the potential to hoist themselves up into more dignified lives" led by their thegnly counterparts.[109] All the wealthy would have heard that misdirected

---

[105] *VH*, pp. 206, line 170 ("bocland") and 207, line 194 ("botl and getimbro").

[106] *VH*, pp. 207, line 188 ("oferflownes") and 208, lines 206–7 ("heah ar" and "woruldgeþinge"). "Heah ar" is a variant reading in CCCC 421 of "heah ham" (lofty home).

[107] *VH*, pp. 209–10, lines 221–23 (with readings from CCCC 421, Scragg's MS **N**): "mid þam readdestan godewebbe…mid þy biorhtestan gold, and mid þam diorwyrðan gimmum."

[108] *VH*, p. 210, lines 232–35 ("rican," "cyningas," "ealdormen," and "demeras").

[109] Fleming, "New Wealth" (see above, n. 35), 8. For the statutes, see "The Exeter Guild Statutes" in *English Historical Documents I: c. 500–1042*, ed. and trans. Dorothy Whitelock (London, 1968), p. 559.
On the prosperity of Exeter, see John Allan, Christopher Henderson, and Robert Higham, "Saxon Exeter," in *Anglo-Saxon Towns in Southern England*, ed. Jeremy Haslam (Chichester, 1984), pp. 385, 397–98, and 405.

love from God to worldly goods, misconjecture about the length of one's lifespan, and misplaced confidence in the security of possessions, power, and position create missed opportunities to be grateful to God and generous to the poor.[110] It would not have escaped them that unless countered with almsgiving, their conspicuous accumulation and display would cost them their souls. Of course, such connections between this audience and this particular sermon, however plausible, are impossible to prove with certainty. Reading Vercelli X in conjunction with the supplementary sermons placed next to it and in the context of CCCC 419 and 421 at least demonstrates the degree to which the homily's internal and implied audiences could mirror a specific audience at a specific place on a specific occasion. The exercise enables us to extrapolate with more confidence when analysing the role of this powerful sermon in other manuscripts in combinations with other homilies.

L2 Conclusion

Built on hints and speculation but grounded in specific manuscripts and individual copies of a homily, the analyses above anticipate the kind of work that ECHOE will facilitate. Its digital editions will make it easier to identify and trace the verbal resonances and thematic complementarities that yield more precise understandings of the roles a homily played and the meanings it may have generated in a particular manuscript. This work in turn helps to clarify circumstances of reception and delivery, and thus the relevance compilers and preachers saw in a sermon or group of sermons for addressing the dynamic cultural shifts taking place in their day. Happily, the project will not be limited to one sermon as has been the case with this

---

Exeter was home to England's seventh largest mint (among eighty-seven) (David Hill, *An Atlas of Anglo-Saxon England* [Toronto, 1984], p. 130).

[110] For the analysis on which this summary statement draws, see Upchurch, "Call to Alms" (see above, n. 5), 435.

essay but rather will make accessible all the anonymous Old English homilies for study, appreciation, and delight.[111]

[111] This essay is based on a paper presented at the Göttingen Conference on Anonymous Old English Homilies held at the University of Göttingen in July 2017. I am grateful to the participants for their feedback and to the editors and anonymous reader for their helpful suggestions.

Bibliography

Acker, Lieven van. “Ein vorläufiges Verzeichnis der Gedichte des Petrus Pictor.” *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 5 (1968): 300–306.

Allan, John, Christopher Henderson, and Robert Higham. “Saxon Exeter.” In *Anglo-Saxon Towns in Southern England*, edited by Jeremy Haslam, 385–414. Chichester: Phillimore, 1984.

Allen, Michael J. B., and Daniel G. Calder. *Sources and Analogues of Old English Poetry: The Major Latin Texts in Translation*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1976.

Amos, Thomas L. “The *Catechesis Cracoviensis* and Hiberno-Latin Exegesis on the *Pater Noster*.” *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 13 (1990): 77–107.

———. “Early Medieval Sermons and Their Audience.” In *De l’homélie au sermon: Histoire de la prédication médiévale*, edited by Jacqueline Hamesse and Xavier Hermand, 1–14. Publications de l’institut d’études Mediévales 14. Louvain-La-Neuve: Collège Erasme, 1993.

———. “The Origin and Nature of the Carolingian Sermon.” PhD diss., Michigan State, 1983.

———. “Preaching and the Sermon in the Carolingian World.” In *De ore Domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*, edited by Thomas L. Amos, Eugene Green, and Beverly Mayne Kienzle, 41–60. Studies in Medieval Culture 27. Kalamazoo (Michigan): Medieval Institute Publications, 1989.

Assmann, Bruno, ed. *Angelsächsische Homilien und Heiligenleben*. Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 3. Kassel: Wigand, 1889. Reprinted with new introduction by Peter Clemoes. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.

Astås, Reidar. *An Old Norse Biblical Compilation: Studies in Stjórn*. American University Studies 108. New York: Lang, 1991.

Atherton, Mark. “The Sources of Bazire and Cross Homily X.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The Sources of Blickling Homily IV.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The Sources of Blickling Homily XIV.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/(site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The Sources of Brotanek Homily II.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The Sources of Vercelli Homily III.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The Sources of Vercelli Homily V.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The Sources of Vercelli Homily VI.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The Sources of Vercelli Homily XV.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

Atkinson, Robert, ed. *The Passions and Homilies from the Leabhar Breac*. Todd Lecture Series 2. Dublin: Hodges, Figges, 1887.

Attwood, Katrina. "*Leiðarvísan* and the 'Sunday Letter' Tradition in Scandinavia." In *Til heiðurs og hugbótar: Greinar um trúarkveðskap fyrri alda*, edited by Svanhildur Óskarsdóttir and Anna Guðmundsdóttir, 53–78. Rit 1. Reykholt: Snorrastofa, 2003.

Augustine. *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus*. Edited by Radbodus Willems. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.

Ayoub, Lois. "Old English *wæta* and the Medical Theory of the Humours." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 94.3 (1995): 332–46.

Azar, Michael G. *Exegeting the Jews: The Early Reception of the Johannine Jews*. Bible in Ancient Christianity 10. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Baker, Peter S., and Michael Lapidge, eds. *Byrhtferth's Enchiridion*. Early English Text Society Supplementary Series 15. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Barlow, Frank. "Edward [St. Edward; Known as Edward the Confessor]." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, May 25, 2006. DOI: 10.1093/ref:odnb/8516. Accessed July 2019.

———. "Leofric." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, September 23, 2004. DOI: 10.1093/ref:odnb/16471. Accessed July 2019.

———. "Leofric and His Times." In *Leofric of Exeter: Essays in Commemoration of the Foundation of Exeter Cathedral Library in A.D. 1072*, edited by Frank Barlow, Kathleen M. Dexter, Audrey M. Erskine, and L. J. Lloyd, 1–16. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1972.

Barré, Henri. *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre*. Studi e testi 225. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1962.

———. "La lettre du Pseudo-Jérome sur l'Assomption: Est-elle antérieur à Paschase Radbert?" *Revue bénédictine* 68 (1958): 203–225.

———. "Sermons marials inédits 'in Natali Domini'." *Marianum: Ephemerides Mariologiae* 25 (1963): 39–93.

Barthold, Claudia, ed. *De viris illustribus: Berühmte Männer*. 2nd ed. Sammlung Tusculum. Mülheim: Carthusianus, 2011.

Bately, Janet. *Anonymous Old English Homilies: A Preliminary Bibliography of Source Studies.* Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1993.

Batiouchkof, Theodor D. "Le débat de l'âme et du corps." *Romania* 20, no. 77 (1891): 1–55.

Bauckman, Richard. "The *Apocalypse of the Seven Heavens*: The Latin Version." *Apocrypha* 4 (1993): 141–75. Reprinted in *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 93, 304–31. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Bäuml, Franz. "Varieties and Consequences of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy." *Speculum* 55, no. 2 (1980): 237–65.

Bayless, Martha, and Michael Lapidge, eds. *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*. Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 14. Dublin: School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1998.

Bazire, Joyce, and James E. Cross, eds. *Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies*. 2nd ed. King's College London Medieval Studies 4. 1982. Reprint, London: King's College London Medieval Studies, 1989.

Becker, Gustav. *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui*. Bonn: Max. Cohen et filium, 1885.

Becker, Wolfgang. "The Latin Manuscript Sources of the Old English Translations of the Sermon *Remedia Peccatorum*." *Medium Ævum* 45, no. 2 (1976): 145–52.

Bedingfield, Marvin Bradford. *The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 1. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2002.

Belfour, Algernon O., ed. *Twelfth Century Homilies in MS Bodley 343, I. Text and Translation*. Early English Text Society Original Series 137. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1909. Reprint, 1998.

Berschin, Walter. “Dinamius Patricius von Marseille († Nach 597).” In *Mittellateinische Studien*, edited by Walter Berschin, 9–15. Heidelberg: Mattes, 2005.

Bertram, Jerome, ed. and trans. *The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries. Critical Texts with Translations and Commentary*. Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2005.

Bethurum, Dorothy, ed. *The Homilies of Wulfstan*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1957.

Beyers, Rita. “The Transmission of Marian Apocrypha in the Latin Middle Ages.” *Apocrypha* 23 (2012): 115–38.

Bibliotheca Monachorum Ordinis S. Benedicti Abbatiae Montis Casini. 5 vols. Monte Cassino: Typographia Casanensi, 1873–94.

Bibliowicz, Abel Mordechai. “The Anti-Jewish Strand in Chrysostom.” In *Jews and Gentiles in the Early Jesus Movement: An Unintended Journey*, 185–92. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Biggs, Frederick M. “Ælfric as Historian: His Use of Alcuin’s *Laudationes* and Sulpicius’s *Dialogues* in His Two Lives of Martin.” In *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints’ Lives and Their Contexts*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach, 289–315. SUNY Series in Medieval Studies. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1996.

———. “The Fourfold Division of Souls: The Old English ‘Christ III’ and the Insular Homiletic Tradition.” *Traditio* 45 (1990): 35–51.

———. “A Further Quotation of Columbanus in Alchfrid’s Letter to Hyglac.” *Notes and Queries* n.s. 53, no. 1 (2006): 12–14.

———. “An Introduction and Overview of Recent Work.” In *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England*, edited by Kathryn Powell and Donald G. Scragg, 1–25. Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 2. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Brewer, 2003.

———. *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha*. Instrumenta Anglistica Mediaevalia 1. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007.

———. *The Sources of "Christ III": A Revision of Cook's Notes*. Old English Newsletter Subsidia 12. Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1986.

———. "Vercelli Homily 6 and the Apocryphal *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*." *Notes and Queries* n.s. 49, no. 2 (2002): 176–78.

Biggs, Frederick M., Thomas D. Hill, and Paul E. Szarmach, eds. *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version*. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 74. Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1990.

———, eds. Sources of Old English and Anglo-Latin Literary Culture [Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture]. https://github.com/SOEALLC/. Accessed 2019 July 31.

Biggs, Frederick M., Thomas D. Hill, Paul E. Szarmach, and E. Gordon Whatley, eds. *Abbo of Fleury, Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and Acta Sanctorum*. Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: Main Series 1. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2001.

Bischoff, Bernard. *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen*. 4 vols. Vol. 4 edited by Birgit Ebersperger. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998–2017.

———. "Turning-Points in the History of Latin Exegesis in the Early Middle Ages." Translated by Colm O'Grady. In *Biblical Studies: The Medieval Irish Contribution*, edited by Martin McNamara. Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association 1. Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1976.

———. "Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter." *Sacris Erudiri* 6 (1954): 189–279. Reprinted with revisions in *Mittelalterliche Studien:*

Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte, 1:205–73. 3 vols. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1966–81.

Bischoff, Bernard, and Michael Lapidge. *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Bischoff, Bernard, and Bengt Löfstedt, eds. *Anonymus ad Cuimnanum: Expossitio Latinitas*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 133D. Turnhout: Brepols, 1992.

Bittner, Maximilian. "Der vom Himmel gefallene Brief in seinen Morgenländischen Versionen und Rezensionen." *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 51, no. 1 (1906): 1–240.

Blatt, Franz. *Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud Anthropophagos*. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930.

Bloch, Howard R. *God's Plagiarist: Being an Account of the Fabulous Industry and Irregular Commerce of the Abbé Migne*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Boenig, Robert. *The Acts of Andrew in the Country of the Cannibals: Translations from the Greek, Latin, and Old English*. Garland Library of Medieval Literature, Series B, 70. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Bollandists, ed. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*. 2 vols. Brussels: Socii Bollandiani, 1898–1901.

Bonnet, Max, ed. *Acta apostolorum apocrypha* II/1. Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1898.

Boretius, Alfred. *Admonitio generalis*. In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Capitularia Regum Francorum*, 1:52–62. Hanover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1883. https://archive.org/details/capitulariaregum01bore/page/n5. Accessed July 2019.

Boyarin, Jonathan. *The Unconverted Self: Jews, Indians, and the Identity of Christian Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Boyarin, Daniel, and Virginia Burrus. “Hybridity as Subversion of Orthodoxy? Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity.” *Social Compass* 52, no. 4 (2005): 431–41.

Boyd, David Lorenzo, and Ruth Mazo Karras. “The Interrogation of a Male Transvestite Prostitute in Fourteenth-Century London.” *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 1, no. 4 (1995): 459–65.

Bredehoft, Thomas A. *Authors, Audiences, and Old English Verse*. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 5. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

———. *Early English Metre*. Toronto Old English Series 15. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

———. “Filling the Margins of CCCC 41: Textual Space and a Developing Archive.” *The Review of English Studies* 57, no. 232 (2006): 721–32.

Brent, Justin. “The Legend of the Soul and Body in Medieval England.” PhD diss., State University of New York at Stony Brook, 2000.

Britannica: Max Förster zum sechzigsten Geburtstage. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1929.

Broderick, Herbert Reginald. *Moses the Egyptian in the Illustrated Old English Hexateuch (London, British Library Cotton MS Claudius B.IV)*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2017.

Brotanek, Rudolf. *Texte und Untersuchungen zur altenglischen Literatur und Kirchengeschichte*. Halle: Niemeyer, 1913.

Brunel, Clovis. “Versions espagnole, provençale, et française de la Lettre du Christ tombée du ciel.” *Analecta Bollandiana* 58 (1950): 383–96.

Bruyne, Donatien de. “Fragments retrouvés d’apocryphes priscillianistes.” *Revue bénédictine* 24 (1907): 318–35.

———, ed. *Prefaces to the Latin Bible*. Studia Traditionis Theologiae 19. Turnhout: Brepols, 2015. First published 1920 by Godenne (Namure, Belgium).

Burrus, Virginia. *"Begotten, Not Made": Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity*. Figurae: Reading Material Culture. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Cadden, Joan. *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages: Medicine, Science, and Culture*. Cambridge Studies in the History of Medicine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Caie, Graham D., ed. *The Old English Poem* Judgement Day II*: A Critical Edition with Editions of* De die Iudicii *and the Hatton 113 Homily* Be domes dæge. Anglo-Saxon Texts 2. Cambridge: Brewer, 2000.

Callison, Tolliver C. "An Edition of Previously Unpublished Homilies in MSS. CCCC 302 and Cotton Faustina A.Ix." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1973.

Cameron, Angus. "A List of Old English Texts." In *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*, edited by Roberta Frank and Angus Cameron, 25–306. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.

Cameron, Angus, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey, et al., ed. *Dictionary of Old English: A to H online*. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, 2016.

———. *Dictionary of Old English: A to I online*. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, 2018.

Cameron, Malcolm. *Anglo-Saxon Medicine*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Campbell, Alistair. *Old English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Canal-Sánchez, José-María. "Antiguas Versiones latinas del Protoevangelio de Santiago." *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 18 (1968): 431–73.

Carey, John. *Apocrypha Hiberniae,* II*: Apocalyptica, 1: In Tenga Bithnua—The Ever-New Tongue*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum 16. Turnhout: Brepols, 2009.

———. "The Reception of Apocryphal Texts in Medieval Ireland." In *The Other Side: Apocryphal Perspectives on Early Medieval "Orthodoxies*," edited by Tobias Nicklas,

Candida R. Moss, Christopher M. Tuckett, and Joseph Verheyden, 251–69. Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus 117. Tübingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2017.

———. "The Reichenau Seven Heavens Homily." In *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, edited by John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 1:189–95. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.

———. "The Seven Heavens and the Twelve Dragons in Insular Apocalyptic." In *Apocalyptic and Eschatological Heritage: The Middle East and Celtic Realms*, edited by Martin McNamara, 12–36. Dublin: Four Courts, 2003.

———. "The Seven Heavens in *Fís Adomnáin*." In *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, edited by John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 1:197–200. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.

———. "The Seven Heavens: Introduction." In *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, edited by John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 1:158–70. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.

Carey, John, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, eds. *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*. 2 vols. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.

Cassian, John. *Collationes XXIIII*. Edited by Michael Petschenig and with supplements by Gottfried Kreuz. 2nd ed. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004.

Cataldi, Claudio. "*Trinity Homily XXIX De Sancto Andrea* between Tradition and Innovation." *Anglia* 135, no. 4 (2017): 641–68.

Cerquiglini, Bernard. *Éloge de la variante: histoire critique de la philologie*. Des Travaux 8. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1989.

CETEDOC Library of Latin Texts. http://www.brepolis.net. Accessed July 2019.

Chadbon, John Nicholas. “Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Junius 85/86: An Edition of a Witness to the Old English Homiletic Tradition.” PhD diss., University of Leeds, 1993.

Chaney, William A. *The Cult of Kingship in Anglo-Saxon England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

Chase, F. H. *Chrysostom: A Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation.* Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1887.

Chavasse, A. “Les plus anciens types du lectionnaire et de l’antiphonaire romains de la messe.” *Revue bénédictine* 62 (1952): 3–94.

Cheney, C. R., ed. *Handbook of Dates for Students of English History*. Guides and Handbooks 4. London: Royal Historical Society, 1945. Reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Clark, J. M. *The Abbey of St Gall as a Centre of Literature and Art*. Cambridge: University Press, 1926.

Clayton, Mary. *The Apocryphal Gospels of Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

———. “Blickling Homily XIII Reconsidered.” *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 17 (1986): 25–40.

———. *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

———. “Delivering the Damned: A Motif in OE Homiletic Prose.” *Medium Ævum* 55, no. 1 (1986): 92–102.

———. “Homiliaries and Preaching in Anglo-Saxon England.” *Peritia* 4 (1985): 207–42. Reprinted with corrections in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach, 151–98. Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 5. New York: Garland, 2000.

———. “The Sources of Blickling Homily I.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The Sources of Blickling Homily XIII.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The Sources of Blickling Homily XIII (Supplementary).” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The Sources of the Homily on the Assumption of the Virgin.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1996. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The *Transitus Mariae*: The Tradition and Its Origins.” *Apocrypha* 10 (1999): 74–98.

Clemoes, Peter, ed. *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: First Series*. Early English Text Society Supplementary Series 17. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

———. “The Chronology of Ælfric’s Works.” In *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of Their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickins*, edited by Peter Clemoes, 212–47. London: Bowes and Bowes, 1959.

Clinksales, Orline. “Text, Translation, and Glossary, of Vercelli Homily XIX.” MA thesis, University of Texas, 1938.

Cohen, Adam. “King Edgar Leaping and Dancing before the Lord.” In *Imagining the Jew in Anglo-Saxon Literature and Culture*, edited by Samantha Zacher, 219–36. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 21. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. “The Becoming Liquid of Margery Kempe.” In *Medieval Identity Machines*, 154–87. Medieval Cultures 35. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

———. “Was Margery Kempe Jewish?.” *In the Middle: Peace Love and the Middle Ages*, April 21, 2006. http://www.inthemedievalmiddle.com/2006/04/was-margery-kempe-jewish.html. Accessed July 2019.

Collins, Marie, Jocelyn Price, and Andrew Hammer, eds. “J. E. Cross: A Biographical Note.” In *Sources and Relations: Studies in Honour of J. E. Cross*, 3–6. Leeds Studies in English, n. s. 16. Leeds: University of Leeds, School of English, 1985.

Columbanus. *De mundi transitu*. In *Sancti Columbani Opera*, edited by G. S. M. Walker. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1957.

Conti, Aidan Keally. “The Circulation of the Old English Homily in the Twelfth Century: New Evidence from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343.” In *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, edited by Aaron J. Kleist, 365–402. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.

———. “Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 44.” e-codices, 2014. http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/description/bke/0044/. Accessed 10 March 2019.

———. “Preaching Scripture and Apocrypha: A Previously Unidentified Homiliary in an Old English Manuscript, Oxford Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343.” PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2004.

———. “The Taunton Fragment and the Homiliary of Angers: Context for New Old English.” *The Review of English Studies* n.s. 60, no. 243 (2009): 1–33.

Conti, Aidan Keally, and Orietta Da Rold. “Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 (2406).” In *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, edited by Orietta Da Rold, Takako Kato, Mary Swan, and Elaine M. Treharne. Leicester: University of Leicester, 2010. https://em1060.stanford.edu/oxford-bodleian-library-bodley-343-2406. Accessed July 2019.

Contreni, John. Review of *Friguli Commentarius in evangelium secundum Matthaeum*, by Anthony J. Forte. *Medieval Review*, November 21, 2019.

https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/tmr/article/view/28938. Accessed January 2020.

Cook, A. S. *The Christ of Cynewulf: A Poem in Three Parts, the Advent, the Ascension and the Last Judgment*. Boston: Athenaeum, 1900.

Cooper, Tracey-Anne. *Monk-Bishops and the English Benedictine Reform Movement: Reading London, BL, Cotton Tiberius A. iii in Its Manuscript Context*. Studies and Texts 193. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2015.

Cornelius, Ian. *Reconstructing Alliterative Verse: The Pursuit of a Medieval Meter*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Cross, James E. "Ælfric—Mainly on Memory and Creative Method in Two Catholic Homilies" 41 (1969): 135–55.

———. "Ælfric and the Mediaeval Homiliary—Objection and Contribution." *Scripta minora Regiae Societatis humaniorum litterarum Lundensis* 4 (1961–62): 1–34.

———. "Atto of Vercelli, 'De pressuris ecclesiasticis' Archbishop Wulfstan and Wulfstan's 'Commonplace Book.'" *Traditio* 48 (1993): 237–46.

———. "Blickling Homily XIV and the Old English Martyrology on John the Baptist." *Anglia* 93 (1975): 145–60.

———. "Cain's Jawbone: Earlier Allusions." In *KM 80: A Birthday Album for Kenneth Muir, Tuesday, 5 May 1987*, edited by A. Kettle, 32–33. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1987.

———, ed. *Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25: A Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*. King's College London Medieval Studies 1. London: King's College London Medieval Studies, 1987.

———. “The Conception of the Old English Phoenix.” In *Old English Poetry: Fifteen Essays*, edited by Robert P. Creed, 129–52. Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 1967.

———. “*De ordine creaturarum liber* in Old English Prose.” *Anglia* 90 (1972): 132–40.

———. Review of *Doctrine and Poetry: Augustine’s Influence on Old English Poetry*, by Bernard Felix Huppé. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 59 (1960): 561–64.

———. “A Doomsday Passage in an Old English Sermon for Lent.” *Anglia* 100 (1982): 103–8.

———. “*The Dry Bones Speak*—A Theme in Some Old English Homilies.” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 56, no. 3 (1957): 434–39.

———. “Gregory, *Blickling Homily X* and Ælfric’s *Passio S. Mauricii* on the World’s Youth and Age.” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 66, no. 3 (1965): 327–30.

———. “Hiberno-Latin Commentaries in Salisbury Manuscripts before 1125 A.D.” *Hiberno-Latin Newsletter* 3 (1989): 8–9.

———. “The Influence of Irish Texts and Traditions on the Old English Martyrology.” *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 81C (1981): 173–92.

———. “The Insular Connections of a Sermon for Holy Innocents.” In *Medieval Literature and Antiquities: Studies in Honour of Basil Cottle*, edited by Myra Stokes and T. L. Burton, 57–70. Cambridge: Brewer, 1987.

———. “‘Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis’: A Sermon for All Saints and Its Use in Old English Prose.” *Traditio* 33 (1977): 101–35.

———. “The Literate Anglo-Saxon: On Sources and Disseminations.” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 58 (1972): 67–100.

———. “More Sources for Two of Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies.” *Anglia* 86 (1968): 59–78.

———. “On Hiberno-Latin Texts and Anglo-Saxon Writings.” In *The Scriptures and Early Medieval Ireland*, edited by Thomas O’Loughlin, 69–79. Instrumenta Patristica 31. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.

———. “On the Blickling Homily for Ascension Day (No. XI).” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 70, no. 2 (1969): 228–40.

———. “Portents and Events at Christ’s Birth: Comments on Vercelli V and VI and the Old English Martyrology.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 2 (1973): 209–20.

———. “A *Sermo de misericordia* in Old English Prose.” *Anglia* 108, no. 3/4 (1990): 429–40.

———. “Towards the Identification of Old English Literary Ideas – Old Workings and New Seams.” In *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach, 77–101. Studies in Medieval Culture 20. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1986.

———, ed. *Two Old English Apocrypha and Their Manuscript Source: The Gospel of Nichodemus and The Avenging of the Saviour*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. “‘Ubi sunt’ Passages in Old English – Sources and Relationships.” In *Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund Årsbok*, 23–44. Lund, 1956.

———. “An Unpublished Story of Michael the Archangel and Its Connections.” In *Magister Regis: Studies in Honor of Robert Earl Kaske*, edited by Art Groos, with Emerson Brown, Jr., Guiseppe Mazzotta, Thomas D. Hill, and Joseph S. Wittig, 24–35. New York: Fordham University Press, 1986.

———. “Vernacular Sermons in Old English.” In *The Sermon*, edited by Beverly Mayne Kienzle and René Noël, 561–96. Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental 81–83. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.

———. “Wulfstan’s *De Anticristo* in a Twelfth-Century Worcester Manuscript.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 20 (1991): 203–20.

Cross, James E., and Thomas D. Hill. *The Prose Solomon and Saturn and Adrian and Ritheus*. McMaster Old English Studies and Texts 1. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Cross, James E., and S. I. Tucker. "Allegorical Tradition and the OE *Exodus*." *Neophilogus* 44, no. 1 (1960): 122–27.

Cummings, Michael J. "Napier Homily 55 and Belfour Homily 10 on the Temptations in the Desert." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 80, no. 4 (1979): 315–24.

Cunningham, Maurice P. "Contents of the Newberry Library Homiliary." *Sacris Erudiri* 7 (1955): 267–301.

Dalbey, Marcia A. "Hortatory Tone in the Blickling Homilies: Two Adaptations of Caesarius." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 70, no. 4 (1969): 641–58.

———. "Patterns of Preaching in the Blickling Easter Homily." *American Benedictine Review* 24, no. 4 (1973): 478–92.

Davies, Wendy. "The Myth of the Celtic Church." In *The Early Church in Wales and the West: Recent Work in Early Christian Archaeology, History and Place Names*, edited by Nancy Edwards and Alan Lane, 12–21. Oxbow Monograph 16. Oxford: Oxbow, 1992.

Dekkers, Eligius, ed. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Enarrationes in psalmos, I-L*. Vol. 2. 3 vols. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 39. Turnhout: Brepols, 1956.

Dekkers, Eligius, and Aemilius Gaar. *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*. 3rd ed. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina. Turnhout: Brepols, 1995.

Delehaye, Hippolyte. "Note sur la légende de la lettre du Christ tombée du ciel." *Bulletin de l'Académie royale belgique, Classe des lettres* 1 (1899): 171–213.

Di Sciacca, Claudia. "Due note a tre omelie anglosassoni sul tema dell'anima e il corpo." In *Antichità germaniche*, 2:223–50. Bibliotheca germanica: Studi e testi 12. Alessandria: dell'Orso, 2002.

———. “Feeding the Dragon: The Devouring Monster in Anglo-Saxon Eschatological Imagery.” *SELIM: Journal of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature* 24, no. 1 (2019): 53–104.

———. *Finding the Right Words: Isidore’s “Synonyma” in Anglo-Saxon England*. Toronto Old English Series 19. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

———. “The *Ubi sunt* Motif and the Soul-and-Body Legend in Old English Homilies: Sources and Relationships.” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 105, no. 3 (2006): 365–87.

Díaz y Díaz, Manuel C., ed. *Liber de ordine creaturarum: Un anónimo irlandés del siglo VII*. Monografías de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela 10. Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 1972.

Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources. Fascicule VIII: O. prep. David Howlett with the assistance of T. Christchev and C. White. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Diesenberger, Maximilian, Yitzhak Hen, and Marianne Pollheimer, eds. *Sermo doctorum: Compilers, Preachers, and Their Audiences in the Early Medieval West*. Sermo 9. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

Dillard, J. L. “*De Parasceve*, An Old English Vernacular Passion.” PhD diss., University of Texas, 1956.

diNapoli, Robert. *An Index of Theme and Image to the Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church: Comprising the Homilies of Ælfric, Wulfstan, and the Blickling and Vercelli Codices*. Hockwold cum Wilton, Norfolk: Anglo-Saxon Books, 1995.

Discenza, Nicole Guenther. *The King’s English: Strategies of Translation in the Old English Boethius*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2005.

DiTommaso, Lorenzo. “Pseudepigrapha Notes II: 3. The Contribution of the Manuscript Catalogues of M.R. James.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudopigrapha* 18, no. 2 (2008): 83–160.

Dockray-Miller, Mary. “Female Devotion and the Vercelli Book.” *Philological Quarterly* 53, no. 4 (2004): 337–54.

Dodwell, C. R. *Anglo-Saxon Art: A New Perspective*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Dolbeau, François. “Critique d’attribution, critique d’authenticité. Réflexions préliminaires.” *Filologia Mediolatina* 6–7 (1999–2000): 33–62.

———. “Deux sermons d’Augustin pour les fêtes de Jean-Baptiste et de Pierre et Paul (s. 293 et 299).” *Augustinianum* 57, no. 2 (2017): 403–92.

———. “Du nouveau sur un sermonnaire de Cambridge.” *Scriptorium* 42, no. 2 (1988): 255–57.

———. *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum miscellaneum. Supplementum*. Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis 67, Supplementum. Turnhout: Brepols, 1990.

———, ed. *Vingt-six sermons au peuple d’Afrique*. 2nd ed. Vol. 147. Collection des études augustiniennes. Série antiquité. Paris: Institut d’études augustiniennes, 2009.

Doležal, Stanislav. “Possible Legal Impact of the Homilies against the Jews by Joannes Chrysostomos.” *Graecolatina Pragensia* 23 (2010): 15–29.

Dorfbauer, Lukas. “Die *Interpretatio Evangeliorum* des ‘Epiphanius Latinus’ (CPL 914) und ihr Verhältnis zum Evangelienkommentar Fortunatians von Aquileia.” *Revue d’études Augustiniennes* 61, no. 1 (2015): 69–110.

———. “Fortunatian von Aquileia und der Matthäus-Kommentar des ‘Frigulus’ (CPL 1121e).” *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 50, no. 1 (2015): 59–90.

Doyle, Conan. “Anglo-Saxon Medicine and Disease: A Semantic Approach.” PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2011.

Drake, Susanna. *Slandering the Jew: Sexuality and Difference in Early Christian Texts*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Dudley, Louise. "An Early Homily on the 'Body and Soul' Theme." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 8, no. 2 (1909): 225–53.

———. *The Egyptian Elements in the Legend of Body and Soul*. Bryn Mawr College Monographs 8. Baltimore: Furst, 1911.

Dufourcq, Albert. *Étude sur les Gesta Martyrum romains.* Vol. 4, *Le Néo-Manichéisme et la légende chrétienne*. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 83.4. Paris, Leroux, 1910. Reprint, Paris: Fontemoing, 1988.

Dumézil, Bruno. "Le patrice Dynamius et son réseau: Culture aristocratique et transformation des pouvoirs autour de Lérins dans la seconde moitié du vi^{e} siècle." In *Lérins, une île sainte de l'antiquité au Moyen Âge*, edited by Yann Codou and Michel Lauwers, 167–93. Collection d'études médiévales de Nice 9 Turnhout: Brepols, 2009.

Dumville, David N. "Biblical Apocrypha and the Early Irish: A Preliminary Investigation." *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 73C (1973): 299–338.

———. "On the Dating of Some Late Anglo-Saxon Liturgical Manuscripts." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 10 (1991): 40–57.

Dyson, Gerald P. *Priests and Their Books in Late Anglo-Saxon England*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 34. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2019.

Edwards, Otis C. *A History of Preaching*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2004.

Étaix, Raymond, ed. "Fragments inédits de l' 'Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum.'" *Revue bénédictine* 84, no. 1–2 (1974): 271–300.

———. "Le grand lectionnaire de Corbie." In *Homéliaires patristiques latins: Recueil d'études de manuscrits médiévaux*, edited by Raymond Étaix, 207–74. Collection des

Études Augustiniennes, Série Moyen-Âge et Temps modernes 29. Paris: Institut d`Études Augustiniennes, 1994.

———. “L’homéliaire carolingien d’Angers.” *Revue bénédictine* 104, no. 1–2 (1994): 148–90.

———. “Le lectionnaire liturgique de la cathédrale de Clerment au X^e^ siècle.” *Bulletin historique et Scientifique de l'Auvergne* 88 (1977): 239–53.

———. “Un manuel de pastorale de l’époque carolingienne (Clm 27152).” *Revue bénédictine* 91 (1981): 105–30.

———. “Le sermonnaire carolingien de Beaune.” *Revue des études augustiniennes* 25 (1979): 106–49.

Everett, Nicholas. “The *Interrogationes de littera et de singulis causis*: An Early Medieval School Text.” *Journal of Medieval Latin* 6 (2006): 227–75.

Fabricius, Johann A. *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti*. 2nd ed. 3 vols. in 2. Hamburg: Schiller and Kisner, 1719.

Fadda, Anna Maria Luiselli, ed. *Nuove omelie anglosassoni della rinascenza benedettina*. Filologia germanica: Testi e studi 1. Florence: Le Monnier, 1977.

Faerber, Robert. “La *Lettre du Christ tombée du ciel* en anglais ancien. Les sermons Napier 43–44.” *Apocrypha* 12 (2001): 173–209.

Falk, Gerhard. *The Jew in Christian Theology: Martin Luther’s Anti-Jewish* Vom Schem Hamphoras*, Previously Unpublished in English, and Other Milestones in Church Doctrine Concerning Judaism*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1992.

Falmagne, Thomas, with Luc Deitz. *Die Echternacher Handschriften bis zum Jahre 1628 in den Beständen der Bibliothèque nationale de Luxembourg sowie der Archives diocésaines de Luxembourg, der Archives nationales, der Section historique de l’Institut grand-ducal und des Grand Séminaire de Luxembourg.* Vol. 1, *Quellen und*

Literaturverzeichnis, Einleitung, Abbildungen. Handschriften des Grossherzogtums Luxemburg 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009.

Faulkner, Mark, and Stephen Pelle. "Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q. 29, Fols. 133–7: An Early Middle English Sermon and Its Context." *Mediaeval Studies* 75 (2013): 147–76.

Fell, Christine. "Perceptions of Transience." In *Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, edited by Malcolm R. Godden and Michael Lapidge, 2nd ed., 180–97. Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Field, Frederick, ed. *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani interpretatio omnium epistolarum Paulinarum per homilias facta*. 7 vols. Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1845–62.

Fiedler, H. G. "The Source of the First Blickling Homily." *Modern Language Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (1903): 122–24.

Fleming, Robin. "Acquiring, Flaunting, and Destroying Silk in Late Anglo-Saxon England." *Early Medieval Europe* 15, no. 2 (2007): 127–58.

———. *Kings and Lords in Conquest England*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 4th series 15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

———. "The New Wealth, the New Rich, and the New Political Style in Late Anglo-Saxon England." *Anglo-Saxon England* 23 (2001): 1–22.

Fleuriot, Léon. *Dictionaire des gloses en vieux Breton*. Collection linguistique 62. Paris: Klincksieck, 1964.

Fonrobert, C. "Jewish Christians, Judaizers, and anti-Judaism." In *Late Ancient Christianity*, edited by Virginia Burrus, 234–54. A People's History of Christianity 2. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: A Register of Written Sources Used by Anglo-Saxon Authors (CD-ROM Version 1.1). Oxford: Fontes Anglo-Saxonici Project, English Faculty, Oxford

University, 2002. Reprinted online, http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

Förster, Max. “Altenglische Predigtquellen, I.” *Archiv* 116 (1906): 301–14.

———. “Altenglische Predigtquellen, II.” *Archiv* 122 (1909): 246–62.

———, ed. *Die Vercelli-Homilien*. Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 12. Hamburg: Grand, 1932. Reprint, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.

———. “Die Weltzeitalter bei den Angelsachsen.” In *Neusprachliche Studien: Festgabe Karl Luick zu seinem sechzigsten Geburstage*, edited by Friedrich Wild, 183–203. Die neueren Sprachen 6. Marburg: Elwert, 1925.

———. “A New Version of the *Apocalypse of Thomas* in Old English.” *Anglia* 73, no. 1 (1955): 6–36.

———. “Über die Quellen von Ælfrics exegetischen Homiliae Catholicae.” *Anglia* 16 (1894): 1–61.

———. *Über die Quellen von Ælfric’s Homiliae Catholicae. I. Legenden*. PhD diss., Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität Bonn. Berlin: Vogt, 1892.

———. “Zu den Blickling Homilies.” *Archiv* 91 (1893): 179–206.

———. “Zur altenglischen Quintinus-Legende.” *Archiv* 106 (1901): 258–61.

———. “Zur vierten Blickling Homily.” *Archiv* 103 (1899): 149.

Forte, Anthony J. *Friguli Commentarius in evangelium secundum Matthaeum*. Rarissima Medaevalia 6. Aschendorff: Monasterii Westfalorum, 2018.

Fournier, Paul, Edmond Maignien, and Auguste Prudhomme. *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements. Tome VII: Grenoble.* Paris: Plon, 1889.

Fox, Hilary. “The Talking Dead: Exhortations of the Dead to the Living in Anglo-Saxon Writing.” In *Dealing with the Dead: Mortality and Community in Medieval and Early*

Modern Europe, edited by Thea Tomaini, 17–35. Explorations in Medieval Culture 5. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Fox, Michael. "Alcuin's *Expositio in epistolam ad Hebraeos*." *Journal of Medieval Latin* 18 (2008): 326–45.

———. "Vercelli Homilies XIX-XXI, the Ascension Day Homily in Cambridge, Corpus Christi 162, and the Catechetical Tradition from Augustine to Wulfstan." In *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, edited by Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, 254–79. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 4. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2009.

Foxhall Forbes, Helen. "Affective Piety and the Practice of Penance in Late-Eleventh-Century Worcester: The Address to the Penitent in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121." *Anglo-Saxon England* 44 (2015): 309–45.

Fraipont, Jean, ed. *Sancti Fulgentii Episcopi Ruspensis Opera*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 91A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1968.

Frank, Roberta, and Angus Cameron, eds. *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English*. Toronto Old English Series 2. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1973.

Fransen, Paul-Irénée, ed. *In epistolam secundam ad Corinthios, in epistolas ad Galatas, Ephesios et Philippenses*. Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis 200B. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011.

Frantzen, Allen J. *Desire for Origins: Old English, New Language, and Teaching the Tradition*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1991.

Frede, Hermann Josef. *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel*. 4th ed. Vetus Latina, 1/1. Freiburg: Herder, 1995.

Fulk, Robert D. "Anglian Dialect Features in Old English Anonymous Homiletic Literature: A Survey, with Preliminary Findings." In *Studies in the History of the English Language IV: Empirical and Analytical Advances in the Study of English Language*

Change, edited by Susan M. Fitzmaurice and Donka Minkova, 81–100. Topics in English Linguistics 61. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2008.

———. *A History of Old English Meter*. Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.

———. "The Refashioning of Christ's Passion in an Anonymous Old English Homily for Palm Sunday (HomS 18)." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 116, no. 4 (2017): 415–37.

Fulk, Robert D., Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles, eds. *Klaeber's Beowulf*. 4th ed. Toronto Old English Series 21. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Gameson, Richard. *The Earliest Books of Canterbury Cathedral: Manuscripts and Fragments to c. 1200*. Canterbury Sources 4. London: Oxford University Press, 2008.

———. *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c. 1066–1130)*. British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Garbáty, Thomas J. "The Smiths." In *Medieval English Literature*, 671. Lexington, MA: Heath, 1984.

Gatch, Milton McCormick. "Two Uses of Apocrypha in Old English Homilies." *Church History* 33, no. 4 (1964): 379–91.

———. "The Unknowable Audience of the Blickling Homilies." *Anglo-Saxon England* 18 (1989): 99–115.

Geerard, Maurice. *Clavis apocryphorum Novi Testamenti*. Corpus Christianorum, Claves. Turnhout: Brepols, 1992.

Getz, Robert. "More on the Sources of Blickling Homily III." *Notes and Queries* n.s. 57, no. 3 (2010): 281–90.

Gijsel, Jan. *Libri de nativitate Mariae: Pseudo-Matthaei Evangelium, textus et commentarius*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum 9. Turnhout: Brepols, 1997.

Gneuss, Helmut. “Guide to the Editing and Preparation of Texts for the Dictionary of Old English.” In *The Editing of Old English: Papers from the 1990 Manchester Conference*, edited by Donald G. Scragg and Paul E. Szarmach, 7–26. Cambridge: Brewer, 1994.

———. “The Homiliary of the Taunton Fragments.” *Notes and Queries* n.s. 52, no. 4 (2005): 440–42.

———. “Liturgical Books in Anglo-Saxon England and Their Old English Terminology.” In *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss, 91–141. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

———. “Origin and Provenance of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: The Case of Cotton Tiberius A.III.” In *Of the Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, Their Scribes and Readers: Essays Presented to M. B. Parkes*, edited by Pamela R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim, 13–48. Aldershot, UK: Scolar, 1997.

Gneuss, Helmut, and Michael Lapidge. *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 15. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

Godden, Malcolm R., ed. *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*. Early English Text Society Supplementary Series 18. London: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———, ed. *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: The Second Series*. Early English Text Society Supplementary Series 5. London: Oxford University Press, 1979.

———. “Old English Composite Homilies from Winchester.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 4 (1975): 57–65.

Göhler, Theodor. “Das Spätwerk Max Försters: Eine Bibliographie.” *Anglia* 74 (1956): 416–26.

Goldast, Melchoir. *Paraeneticorum Veterum, pars I*. Lindau: Brem, 1604.

Goodwin, Charles Wycliffe. *The Anglo-Saxon Legends of St. Andrew and St. Veronica*. Cambridge Antiquarian Society, Octavo Series 1. Cambridge: Deighton, Macmillan and Co., 1851.

Goossens, Louis, ed. *The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels, Royal Library 1650*. Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van Belgie, Klasse der Letteren 36.74. Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1974.

Gordon, I. L., ed. *The Seafarer*. Methuen's Old English Library. London: Methuen, 1960.

Gorman, Michael. "The Carolingian Miscellany of Exegetical Texts in Albi 39 and Paris Lat. 2175." *Scriptorium* 51, no. 2 (1997): 336–54. Reprint, *Biblical Commentaries from the Early Middle Ages*, 476–94. Millennio Medievale 32, Reprints 4. Florence: SISMEL, 2002.

———. "A Critique of Bischoff's Theory of Irish Exegesis: The Commentary on Genesis in Munich Clm 6302 (Wendepunkte 2)." *Journal of Medieval Latin* 7 (1997): 178–233.

———. "The Encyclopedic Commentary on Genesis Prepared for Charlemagne by Wigbod." *Recherches augustiniennes* 17 (1982): 173–201. Reprint, *Biblical Commentaries from the Early Middle Ages*, 1–29. Millennio Medievale 32, Reprints 4. Florence: SISMEL, 2002

———. "The Visigothic Commentary on Genesis in Autun 27." *Études Augustiniennes* 30 (1997): 167–76. Reprint, *Biblical Commentaries from the Early Middle Ages*, 323–433. Millennio Medievale 32, Reprints 4. Florence: SISMEL, 2002

Gougaud, L. "Les relations de l'abbaye de Fleury-sur-Loire avec la Bretagne et les Iles Britanniques (X^{e} et XI^{e} siècles)." *Mémoires de la Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Bretagne* 4 (1923): 3–30.

Grant, Mark, ed. and trans. *Galen, on Food and Diet*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Green, Monica H. “Bodily Essences: Bodies as Categories of Difference.” In *A Cultural History of the Human Body*. Vol. 2*, In the Medieval Age*, edited by Linda Kalof, 149–71. New York: Berg, 2010.

Greenfield, Stanley B., and Fred C. Robinson. *A Bibliography of Publications on Old English Literature from the Beginnings to the End of 1972*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

Grégoire, Otto Gunther, Manlio Simonetti, and Vincent Bulhart, eds. *Gregorius Iliberritanus, Faustinus Luciferianus*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 69. Turnhout: Brepols, 1967.

Grégoire, Réginald. *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux: Analyse de manuscrits*. Biblioteca Degli “Studi Medievali” 12. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull’alto Medioevo, 1980.

Gregory the Great. *Homiliae in evangelia*. Edited by Raymond Étaix. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 141. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.

Gretsch, Mechthild. “The Taunton Fragment: A New Text from Anglo-Saxon England.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 33 (2004): 145–93.

———. “Winchester Vocabulary and Standard Old English: The Vernacular in Late Anglo-Saxon England.” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 83, no. 1 (2001): 41–87.

Griesser, Bruno. “Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der *Expositio IV Euangeliorum* des Ps.-Hieronymus.” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 54, no. 1 (1930): 46–61.

———. “Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der Expositio IV Evangeliorum des Ps. Hieronymus.” *Revue bénédictine* 49 (1937): 279–321.

Gryson, Roger. *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel, Aktualisierungsheft 2004*. Vetus Latina, 1/1D. Freiburg: Herder, 2004.

———. *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l'antiquité et du haut Moyen Âge*. 5th ed. 2 vols. Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 1/1[5]. Freiburg: Herder 2007.

Guglielmetti, Rossana E. "Deux témoins inédits de la *Visio Pauli*." *Apocrypha* 26 (2015): 57–78.

Haines, Dorothy Ina. "Rhetorical Strategies in Old English Prose." PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1998.

———, ed. and trans. *Sunday Observance and the Sunday Letter in Anglo-Saxon England*. Anglo-Saxon Texts 8. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Brewer, 2010.

Hall, Joseph. *Selections from Early Middle English, 1130-1250*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1920.

Hall, Thomas N. "The Armaments of John the Baptist in Blickling Homily 14 and the Exeter Book *Descent into Hell*." In *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, edited by Virginia Blanton and Helene Scheck, 289–306. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 334. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2008.

———. "A Bibliography of the Writings of J. E. Cross 1985–2000." In *Via Crucis: Studies in Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross*, edited by Thomas N. Hall, 433–38. Medieval European Studies 1. Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2002.

———. "The Development of the Common of Saints in the Early English Versions of Paul the Deacon's Homiliary." In *Anglo-Saxon Books and Their Readers: Essays in Celebration of Helmut Gneuss's Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, edited by Thomas N. Hall and Donald Scragg, 31–67. Publications of the Richard Rawlinson Center. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2008.

———. “John Chrysostom.” In *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture.* Vol. 5, *Julius Caesar to Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria*, edited by Thomas N. Hall. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, n.d. https://github.com/SOEALLC/. Accessed May 2020.

———. “Latin Sermons for Saints in Early English Homiliaries and Legendaries.” In *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice and Appropriation*, edited by Aaron J. Kleist, 227–64. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.

———. “The Portents at Christ’s Birth in Vercelli Homilies V and VI: Some Analogues from Medieval Sermons and Biblical Commentaries.” In *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, edited by Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, 62–97. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

———. “Preaching at Winchester in the Early Twelfth Century.” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 104, no. 2 (2005): 189–218.

———. “The Reversal of the Jordan in Vercelli Homily 16 and in Old English Literature.” *Traditio* 45 (1989–90): 53–86.

———. Preface to *Via Crucis: Studies in Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross*, edited by Thomas N. Hall, xiv–xv. Medieval European Studies 1. Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2002.

Hamman, Adalbert. “Les principaux collaborateurs des deux patrologies de Migne.” In *Migne et le renouveau des études patristiques*, edited by A. Mandouze and J. Fouilheron. Théologie historique 66. Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1985.

Harkins, Paul W. Introduction to *Discourses against Judaizing Christians*, by John Chrysostom, translated by Paul W. Harkins. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1979.

Hawk, Brandon. *Preaching Apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England*. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 30. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018.

Healey, Antonette diPaolo, ed. *The Old English Vision of St. Paul*. Speculum Anniversary Monographs 2. Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1978.

———, ed., with John Price and Xin Xiang. *Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus*. http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/pages/pub/web-corpus.html. Accessed July 2019.

Heng, Geraldine. *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Herbert, J. A. *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*. Vol. 3. London: Longmans, 1910.

Herren, Michael W., and Shirley Ann Brown. *Christ in Celtic Christianity: Britain and Ireland from the Fifth to the Tenth Century*. Studies in Celtic History 20. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 2002.

Heyworth, Melanie. "Perceptions of Marriage in *Exeter Book Riddles 20* and *61*." *Studia Neophilologica* 79 (2007): 171–84.

Hill, David. *An Atlas of Anglo-Saxon England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

Hill, Joyce. "Ælfric, Authorial Identity and the Changing Text." In *The Editing of Old English: Papers from the 1990 Manchester Conference*, edited by Donald G. Scragg and Paul E. Szarmach, 177–90. Cambridge: Brewer, 1994.

———. "Ælfric's 'Silent Days.'" *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 16 (1985): 118–31.

———. "Authority and Intertextuality in the Works of Ælfric." In *Proceedings of the British Academy: 2004 Lectures*, edited by P. J. Marshall, 157–82. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 131. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. "Mapping the Anglo-Saxon Intellectual Landscape: The Risks and Rewards of Source-Study." In *Aspects of Anglo-Saxon and Medieval England*, edited by Michiko Ogura, 49–68. Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature 54. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2014.

———. “Two Anglo-Saxon Bishops at Work: Wulfstan, Leofric and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 190.” In *Patterns of Episcopal Power: Bishops in Tenth and Eleventh Century Western Europe*, edited by Ludger Körntgen and Dominik Wassenhoven, 145–61. Prinz-Albert-Forschungen 6. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.

Hill, Laurita Lyttleton. “A Glossary of the Marginal Homilies of MS 41, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.” PhD diss., University of Texas, 1947.

Hill, Thomas D. “CETEDOC and the Transformation of Anglo-Saxon Studies.” *Old English Newsletter* 26, no. 1 (1992): 46–48.

———. “The Seven Joys of Heaven in *Christ III* and Old English Homiletic Texts.” *Notes and Queries* n.s. 16, no. 5 (1969): 165–66.

Hill, Thomas D., Charles D. Wright, and Susan E. Deskis. “Memoirs of Fellows and Corresponding Fellows of the Medieval Academy of America: James E. Cross.” *Speculum* 73, no. 3 (1998): 958–59.

Holloway, Jean. “History in the Homilies.” *Alcalde: The University of Texas Alumni Magazine*, June 1962.

Holmes, Brooke. *Gender: Antiquity and Its Legacy*. Ancients and Moderns. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Holthausen, Ferdinand, and H. Spies, eds. “Der Vercell-Codex CXVII nebst Abdruck einiger altenglischer Homilien der Handschrift.” In *Festschrift für Lorenz Morsbach*, 20–179. Studien zur englischen Philologie 1. Halle: Niemeyer, 1913.

“Homiliar og homiletiske bøker i Noreg, ca. 1050-1550.” Frå handskriftsfragment til bokhistorie. April 12, 2014. https://www.uib.no/node/73418/homiliar-og-homilieb%C3%B8ker-i-noreg-ca-1050-1550. Accessed 10 March 2019.

Hotchkiss, Valerie R. *Clothes Make the Man: Female Cross Dressing in Medieval Europe*. New Middle Ages 1. New York: Garland, 1996.

Howlett, David. “Early Insular Latin Poetry.” *Peritia* 17–18 (2003–4): 61–109.

———. “Two Works of Saint Columban.” *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 28, no. 1 (1993): 27–46.

Huglo, Michel. “Trois livres manuscrits presentés par Helisachar.” *Revue bénédictine* 99 (1989): 272–85.

Hull, Vernam. “Cáin Domnaig.” *Ériu* 20 (1966): 151–77.

Hulme, William H., ed. “The Old English Gospel of Nicodemus.” *Modern Philology* 1, no. 4 (1904): 579–614.

Hume, W. H. “The ‘Ruin Motif’ in Old English Poetry.” *Anglia* 94 (1976): 339–60.

Irvine, Susan E. “The Compilation and Use of Manuscripts Containing Old English in the Twelfth Century.” In *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, edited by Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne, 41–61. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

———. “Linguistic Peculiarities in Late Copies of Ælfric and Their Implications.” In *Essays on Anglo-Saxons and Related Themes in Memory of Lynne Grundy*, edited by Jane Roberts and Janet Nelson, 237–57. King’s College London Medieval Studies. London: Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies, 2000.

———, ed. *Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343*. Early English Text Society Original Series 302. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

———. “The Sources of Irvine Homily 6.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1997. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

———. “The Sources of Irvine Homily 7.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 1997. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

Irving, Edward B. “Latin Prose Sources for Old English Verse.” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 56, no. 4 (1957): 588–95.

Izydorczyk, Zbigniew. *Manuscripts of the Evangelium Nicodemi: A Census*. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Subsidia medievalia 21. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1993.

James, M. R. *Apocrypha Anecdota*. Texts and Studies, 2/3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1893.

———. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912.

———. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Pembroke College, Cambridge.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905.

———. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913.

Janner, Sara, and Romain Jurot. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus*. Vol. IX/2 Schweiz, Verzeichnis nach Bibliotheken. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission zur Herausgabe des Corpus der lateinischen Kirchenväter 20. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2001.

Jeudy, Collette. "Fragments carolingiens de la grammaire de Dynamius (Ms. Darmstadt 3303)." In *History of Linguistic Thought in the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Vivian Law, 127–44. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science: Series 3, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993.

Jiroušková, Lenka, ed. *Die Visio Pauli: Wege und Wandlungen einer orientalischen Apokryphe im lateinischen Mittelalter*. Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 34. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Johnson, David F. "The Five Horrors of Hell: An Insular Homiletic Motif." *English Studies* 74, no. 5 (1993): 414–31.

Joly, Roger. “Bombardement de Chartres, 26 mai 1944.” *Bulletin de La Société archéologique d’Eure-et-Loir* 47, no. 3 (1995): 48–55.

Jonas of Bobbio. *Life of Columbanus*. Translated by A. O’Hara and Ian Wood. Translated Texts for Historians 64. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2017.

Jones, Christopher A. *Ælfric’s Letter to the Monks of Eynsham*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Jones, J. Morris, and John Rhŷs, eds. *The Elucidarium and Other Tracts in Welsh*. Anecdota Oxoniesia: Mediaeval and Modern Series 6–7. Oxford: Clarendon, 1894.

Jones, W. R. “The Heavenly Letter in Medieval England.” *Medievalia et Humanistica* n.s. 6 (1975): 163–78.

Jónsson, Jón Aðalsteinn. “Himnabréf ömmu minnar Guðrúnar Ólafsdóttur frá Eystri-Lyngum í Meðallandi.” *Ritmennt* 10 (2005): 18–48.

Jost, Karl. *Wulfstanstudien*. Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten 23. Bern: Francke, 1950.

Jullien, Marie-Hélène, ed. *Clavis des auteurs latins du Moyen Age: Territoire français 735–987. Tomus III: Faof–Hilduin.* Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis. Turnhout: Brepols 2010.

Jullien, Marie-Hélèn and Françoise Perelman, *Clavis Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi. Auctores Galliae 735–987. Tomus II: Alcuinus* Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis. Turnhout: Brepols 1999.

Kabir, Ananya Jahanara. “From Twelve Devouring Dragons to the *Develes Ers*: The Medieval History of an Apocryphal Punitive Motif.” *Archiv* 238 (2001): 280–98.

———. *Paradise, Death and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Kaestli, Jean-Daniel. “Le *Protévangile de Jacques* en latin: État de la question et perspectives nouvelles.” *Revue d’histoire des textes* 26 (1996): 41–102.

———. “Le *Protévangile de Jacques* latin dans l’homélie *Inquirendum Est* pour la fête de la Nativité de Marie.” *Apocrypha* 12 (2001): 99–153.

Kalleres, Dayna S. *City of Demons: Violence, Ritual, and Christian Power in Late Antiquity.* Oakland: University of California Press, 2015.

Karkov, Catherine E. “The Anglo-Saxon Genesis: Text, Illustration, and Audience.” In *The Old English Hexateuch: Aspects and Approaches*, edited by Benjamin C. Withers and Rebecca Barnhouse, 187–223. Publications of the Richard Rawlinson Center. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2000.

———. “Hagar and Ishmael: The Uncanny and the Exile.” In *Imagining the Jew in Anglo-Saxon Literature and Culture*, edited by Samantha Zacher, 197–218. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 21. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016.

Kaske, R. E. *Medieval Christian Literary Imagery*. Toronto Medieval Bibliographies 11. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Kavanaugh, Anne K. “The Ps.-Jerome *Expositio IV Evangeliorum*.” In *The Scriptures and Early Medieval Ireland: Proceedings of the 1993 Conference of the Society for Hiberno-Latin Studies on Early Irish Exegesis and Homiletics*, edited by Thomas O’Loughlin, 124–31. Instrumenta Patristica 31. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.

Kelly, Joseph F. “A Catalogue of Early Medieval Hiberno-Latin Biblical Commentaries (I).” *Traditio* 44 (1988): 537–71.

———. “A Catalogue of Early Medieval Hiberno-Latin Biblical Commentaries (II).” *Traditio* 45 (1989–90): 393–434.

Kelly, Richard J., ed. *Blickling Homilies*. London: Continuum, 2003.

Ker, Neil R. *A Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1957. Reprinted with a supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

———. *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books.* 2nd ed. Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 3. London: Royal Historical Society, 1964.

———. *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries. II: Abbotsford–Keele.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Keynes, Simon. *An Atlas of Attestations in Anglo-Saxon Charters, c. 670–1066*. ASNC Guides, Texts, and Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic, University of Cambridge, 2002.

Kim, Dorothy, and M. W. Bychowski, ed. "Visions of Medieval Trans Feminism." Special issue, *Medieval Feminist Forum* 55, no.1 (2019).

King, Helen. *The One-Sex Body on Trial: The Classical and Early Modern Evidence*. History of Medicine in Context. Farnham; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013.

Klaeber, Friedrich. "Die christlichen Elemente in *Beowulf*." *Anglia* 35 (1911): 111–36, 249–70, 43–82; 36 (1912): 169–99. Translated by Paul Battles as *The Christian Elements in* Beowulf. Old English Newsletter Subsidia 24. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2000.

Klein, Stacy. "Gender." In *A Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Studies*, edited by Jacqueline A. Stodnick and Renée R. Trilling, 19–54. Cultural Theory Handbooks. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Kleist, Aaron J. *The Chronology and Canon of Ælfric of Eynsham*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 37. Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2019.

Klinck, Anne L. *The Old English Elegies: A Critical Edition and Genre Study*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press, 1992.

Klingshirn, William E. "The Wartime and Post-War Reception of Caesarius of Arles." *Early Medieval Europe* 26, no. 1 (2018): 21–34.

Knuuttila, Simo. "Time and Creation in Augustine." In *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, edited by Eleonore Stump and Norman Kretzmann, 103–15. Cambridge Companions to Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Kölbing, Eugen. “Julius Zupitza: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der englischen Philologie in Deutschland.” *Englische Studien* 21 (1895): 452–71; 22 (1896): 162.

Kopaczyk, Joanna, and Hans Sauer, eds. *Binomials in the History of English: Fixed and Flexible*. Studies in English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Kornexl, Lucia. *Die Regularis Concordia und ihre altenglische Interlinearversion*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie 17. Munich: Fink, 1993.

Kramer, Johanna. *Between Earth and Heaven: Liminality and the Ascension of Christ in Anglo-Saxon Literature*. Manchester Medieval Literature and Culture. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014.

Krapp, George Philip, and Elliott van Kirk Dobbie, eds. *The Exeter Book.* Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 3. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

Kürbis, Brygida, Jerzy Wolny, and Danuta Zydorek, eds. *Praedicationes per Diversa Ieiunia et Varia e Codice Cracoviensi 140 (43) / Kazania Na Różne Dni Postne i Inne Teksty z Kodeksu Krakowskiego 140 (43)*. Monumenta Sacra Polonorum 4. Krakow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2010.

Lacombe, Georges. *La vie et les œuvres de Prévostin*. Prepositini Cancellarii Parisiensis (1206–1210) Opera omnia 1, Bibliothèque thomiste 11. Tournai: Kain, 1927.

Lambot, Cyrille, ed. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Sermones de Vetere Testamento: Id est Sermones I-L secundum ordinem vulgatum insertis etiam novem sermonibus post Maurinos repertis*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 41. Turnhout: Brepols, 1961.

———. “Sermons inédits de s. Augustin pour les fêtes de saints.” *Revue bénédictine* 59 (1949): 55–81.

Langmuir, Gavin I. *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Lapidge, Michael. “Abbot Germanus, Winchcombe, Ramsey and the Cambridge Psalter.” In *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut*

Gneuss on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday, edited by Michael Korhammer, Karl Reichl, and Hans Sauer, 99–129. Cambridge: Brewer, 1992.

———. *Anglo-Latin Literature*. 2 vols. London: Hambledon, 1993–96.

———. *The Anglo-Saxon Library*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

———. "Dynamius Patricius." In *Compendium auctorum Latinorum Medii Aevi*, Vol. 3. Florence, 2000.

———. "Epilogue: Did Columbanus Compose Metrical Verse?" In *Columbanus: Studies on the Latin Writings*, edited by Michael Lapidge, 274–85. Studies in Celtic History 17. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 1997.

———. "Textual Criticism and the Literature of Anglo-Saxon England." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 73, no. 1 (1991): 17–46. Reprinted in *Textual Criticism and Material Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Thomas Northcote Toller and the Toller Memorial Lectures*, edited by Donald G. Scragg, 107–36. Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 1. Cambridge: Brewer, 2003.

Lapidge, Michael, and Richard Sharpe. *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature, 400-1200*. Royal Irish Academy Dictionary of Medical Latin from Celtic Sources, Ancillary Publications 1. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1985.

Laqueur, Thomas Walter. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Lauer, Philippe. *Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits latins. Tome VII (N^os^ 3776 à 3835): Homéliaires*. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale, 1988.

Lawson, Christopher M., ed. *De ecclesiasticis officiis*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 113. Turnhout: Brepols, 1989.

Leclercq, Jean. "Deux anciennes versions de la légende de l'Abbé Macaire." *Revue Mabillon* 36 (1946): 64–79.

Lees, Clare A. “Sunday Letter.” In *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha*, edited by Frederick M. Biggs, 58–61. Instrumenta Anglistica Mediaevalia 1. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007.

———. “The ‘Sunday Letter’ and the ‘Sunday Lists.’” *Anglo-Saxon England* 14 (1985): 129–51.

———. “Theme and Echo in an Anonymous Old English Homily for Easter.” *Traditio* 42 (1986): 115–42.

———. “Whose Text Is It Anyway? Contexts for Editing Old English Prose.” In *The Editing of Old English: Papers from the 1990 Manchester Conference*, edited by Donald G. Scragg and Paul E. Szarmach, 97–114. Cambridge: Brewer, 1994.

Legendre, Olivier, ed. *Collectaneum exemplorum et visionum Clarevallense e codice Trecensi 946*. Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis 208. Turnhout: Brepols, 2005.

Lehmann, Paul. *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*. 5 vols. Munich: Beck, 1918–90.

Lemarié, Joseph. “L’homéliaire 48.12 de la Bibliothèque capitulaire de Tolède. Témoins de deux sermons anciens inédits et du sermon ‘Quod nos hortatus est dominus noster’.” *Revue des études augustiniennes* 27 (1981): 278–300.

———. “Le sermon *Oportet nos, fratres karissimi, gaudere hodie et exultare* de l’homéliaire carolingien dit ‘de Saint-Père de Chartres.’” In *Florentissima proles ecclesiae: Miscellanea hagiographica, historica et liturgica Reginaldo Grégoire OSB XII lustra complementi oblata*, edited by Domenico Gobbi, 373–79. Bibliotheca civis 9. Trent: Civis, 1996.

Lenker, Ursula. *Die westsächsische Evangelienversion und die Perikopenordnungen im angelsächsischen England*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie 20. Munich: Fink, 1997.

———. “The *West Saxon Gospels* and the Gospel-Lectionary in Anglo-Saxon England: Manuscript Evidence and Liturgical Practice.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 28 (1999): 141–78.

LePree, James F., ed. “Pseudo-Basil’s *De admonitio ad filium spiritualem*: A New English Translation.” *Heroic Age* 13 (2010). https://www.heroicage.org/issues/13/lepree2.php. Accessed July 2019.

———. “Two Recently-Discovered Passages of the Pseudo-Basil’s *Admonition to a Spiritual Son* (*De admonitio ad filium spiritualem*) in Smaragdus’ *Commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict* (*Expositio in regulam s. Benedicti*) and the *Letters* (*Epistolae*) of Alcuin.” *Heroic Age*, no. 11 (2008). http://www.heroicage.org/issues/11/lepree.php. Accessed July 2019.

Lerer, Seth. *Error and the Academic Self: The Scholarly Imagination, Medieval to Modern*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Leslie, R. F. *The Wanderer*. Manchester: University Press, 1966.

Letson, Douglas R. “The Poetic Content of the Revival Homily.” In *The Old English Homily and Its Backgrounds*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach and Bernard Felix Huppé, 139–56. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1978.

Levy, Max. *Der Sabbath in England: Wesen und Entwicklung des englischen Sonntags*. Kölner anglistische Arbeiten 18. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1933.

Liebermann, Felix, ed. *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*. 3 vols. Halle: Niemeyer, 1903–16.

Lindsay, W. M., ed. *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*. Scriptorum classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.

Lipsius, Richard A. and Max Bonnet. *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1891–1903.

Lionarons, Joyce Tally. *The Homiletic Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Brewer, 2010.

———. “Textual Appropriation and Scribal (Re)Performance in a Composite Homily: The Case for a New Edition of Wulfstan’s *De Temporibus Anticristi*.” In *Old English Literature in Its Manuscript Context*, edited by Joyce Tally Lionarons, 67–93. Medieval European Studies 5. Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2004.

Locher, Albrecht, ed. *Marii Victorini Afri Commentarii in epistulas Pauli ad Galatas ad Philippenses, ad Ephesios*. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Gracorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Scriptores Romani. Leipzig: Teubner, 1972.

Löfstedt, Bengt. “Grammatisch-rhetorische Fragmente im Anonymus ad Cuimnanum.” *Eranos* 88 (1990): 121–24.

Logeman, H. “Anglo-Saxon Minora.” *Anglia* 12 (1889): 497–518.

Longère, Jean. *La prédication médiévale*. Paris: Etudes augustiniennes, 1983.

Loth, J. “Une glose brittone inédite du IX^{e}-X^{e} siècle un autre d’origine Douteuse.” *Revue Celtique* 50 (1933): 357–62.

Love, R. C. “The Sources of Bede’s *Explanatio Apocalypsis*.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 2000. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

Love, Rosalind. “Anglo-Latin Literature in the Foreground.” In *“Books Most Needful to Know”: Contexts for the Study of Anglo-Saxon England*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach, 1–59. Old English Newsletter Subsidia 36. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 2016.

Lowe, E. A. *Codices Latini Antiquiores*. 12 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1934–1971.

Lowe, Kathryn A. “Filling the Silence: Shared Content in Four Related Manuscripts of Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies.” *Digital Philology: A Journal of Medieval Cultures* 4, no. 2 (2015): 190–224.

Lucas, Peter J. “The Vercelli Book Revisited.” In *The Genesis of Books: Studies in the Scribal Culture of Medieval England in Honour of A. N. Doane*, edited by Matthew T. Hussey

and John D. Niles, 161–74. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 9. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011.

Luther, Martin. *Vom Schem Hamphoras, und vom Geschlecht Christi: Mathei am i. Capitel*. Wittenberg: Rhaw, 1543.

MacGinty, Gerard. *Pauca problesmata de enigmatibus ex tomis canonicis: Praefatio et libri de Pentateucho Moysi*. Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis 173. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.

———, ed. *The Reference Bible / Das Bibelwerk. Inter Pauca Problesmata de Enigmatibus ex Tomis Canonicis*. Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis 173. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.

Machielsen, John. *Clavis Patristica Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi*, 1A–B: *Opera Homiletica*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina. Turnhout: Brepols, 1990.

Magennis, Hugh. "Ælfric Scholarship." In *A Companion to Ælfric*, edited by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, 5–34. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 18. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

———. "'No Sex Please, We're Anglo-Saxons'? Attitudes to Sexuality in Old English Prose and Poetry." *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 26 (1995): 1–26.

———, ed. *The Old English Life of St Mary of Egypt: An Edition of the Old English Text with Modern English Parallel-Text Translation*. Exeter Medieval Texts and Studies. Exeter: Exeter University Press, 2002.

Magennis, Hugh, and Mary Swan, eds. *A Companion to Ælfric*. Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 18. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Mahiques Climent, Joan. "El ciclo narrativo del cura difunto y la misa no celebrada en vida: un precedente historiográfico del siglo XVII." *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares* 69, no. 1 (2014): 189–207.

Mai, Angelo. *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae* I. Rome: Typis Sacri Consilii Propagando Christiano Nomini, 1852.

MANNO: Manuscrits notés en neumes en Occident. "Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France Latin 13768." SAPRAT: Savoirs et Pratiques du Moyen Âge au XIXe siècle, 2012. http://saprat.ephe.sorbonne.fr/media/7dcfb058f4df5470ead1770bbecc01de/latin-13768.pdf. Accessed 1 July 2019.

Marcus, Jacob. *The Jew in the Medieval World: A Sourcebook, 315-1791*. Cincinnati: Sinai, 1938. Reprint, New York: Atheneum, 1978.

Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.

———. *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.

Mayer, Wendy. "Preaching Hatred? John Chrysostom, Neuroscience, and the Jews." In *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, edited by Chris L. De Wet and Wendy Mayer, 1–31. Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

McCord, Laura R. "A Probable Source for the *ubi sunt* Passage in *Blickling Homily V*." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 82, no. 4 (1981): 360–61.

McCoy, Adam Dunbar. "The Use of the Writings of English Authors in Old English Homiletic Literature." PhD diss., Cornell University, 1973.

McCune, James. "The Preacher's Audience, *c*. 800–*c*. 950." In *Sermo doctorum: Compilers, Preachers, and Their Audiences in the Early Medieval West*, edited by Maximilian Diesenberger, Yitzhak Hen, and Marianne Pollheimer, 283–338. Sermo 9. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

———. "The Sermon Collection in the Carolingian Clerical Handbook, Paris, BnF, lat. 1012." *Medieval Studies* 75 (2013): 35–91.

McIntosh, Angus. “Wulfstan’s Prose.” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35 (1949): 109–42.

McKitterick, Rosamond. *The Carolingians and the Written Word*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

———. *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895*. Studies in History Series 2. London: Royal Historical Society, 1977.

McNally, Robert E. “Der irische Liber de numeris: Eine Quellenanalyse des pseudo-isidorischen Liber de numeris.” PhD diss., Universität München, 1957.

McNamara, Martin. *The Apocrypha in the Early Irish Church*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1983.

———. *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1975.

———. *The Bible and the Apocrypha in the Early Irish Church (A.D. 600–1200)*. Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 66. Turnhout: Brepols, 2015.

———. “Irish Homilies A.D. 600–1100.” In *Via Crucis: Studies in Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross*, edited by Thomas N. Hall, 235–84. Medieval European Studies 1. Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2002.

———. “Sources and Affiliations of the Catechesis Celtica. (MS Vat. Reg. Lat. 49).” *Sacris Erudiri* 34 (1994): 185–237.

Meehan, Denis, ed. *Adomnáns De locis sanctis*. Scriptores Latini Hiberniae 3. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1958.

Miceli, Calogero A., trans. “The Epistle of Christ from Heaven.” In *New Testament Apocrypha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*, edited by Tony Burke and Brent Landau, 1:455–63. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016.

Minge, J. P., ed. *Patrologia Graeca*. 161 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1857–1866.

———, ed. *Patrologia Latina*. 221 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1862–1865. Reprinted online, http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk. Accessed July 2019.

Mittman, Asa. "'In Those Days': Giants and the Giant Moses in the Old English Illustrated Hexateuch." In *Imagining the Jew in Anglo-Saxon Literature and Culture*, edited by Samantha Zacher, 237–61. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 21. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016.

Mohlberg, Leo Cunibert, ed. *Liber sacramentorum romanae aeclesiae ordinis anni circuli*. 3rd ed. revised and supplemented by Leo Eizenhöfer. Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta, Series maior, Fontes 4. Rome: Herder, 1981.

Mommsen, Theodor. *Die Kirchengeschichte: Die lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus*. Edited by Eduard Schwartz. Vol. 2 of *Eusebius Werke.* 3 vols. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 9.1–3. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903–9.

Moore. R. I. *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Moreton, Bernard. *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary: A Study in Tradition*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Morin, Germain. *Etudes, textes, découvertes: Contributions à la littérature et à l'histoire des douze premiers siècles*. Vol. 1. Anecdota maredsolana: Seconde Série 60. Paris: Picard, 1913.

———, ed. *Sancti Caesarii episcopi Arelatensis Opera omnia nunc primum in unum collecta*. 2 vols. Bruges: Maretioli, 1937–42. Reprint, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 103–4. Turnhout: Brepols, 1953.

Morris, Richard, ed. *The Blickling Homilies*. 3 vols. Early English Text Society Original Series 58, 63, 73. 1874–1880. Reprint, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.

———, ed. *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises*. Early English Text Society Original Series 29, 34. London: Trübner, 1868.

Mostert, Marco. “Relations between Fleury and England.” In *England and the Continent in the Tenth Century. Studies in Honour of Wilhelm Levison (1876–1947)*, edited by David W. Rollason, Conrad Leyser, and Hannah Williams. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 37. Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.

Munzi, Luigi. “Dinamio Grammatico Cristiano?” In *ΜΟΥΣΑ: Scritti in onore di Giuseppe Morelli*, 393–432. Edizioni e saggi universitari di filologia classica: Fuori sezione 5. Bologna: Pàtron, 1997.

Murfin, Kathleen Much. “An Unedited Old English Homily in MS. Cambridge U.L. Ii.1.33.” MA thesis, Rice University, 1971.

Murray, Michele. *Playing a Jewish Game: Gentile Christian Judaizing in the First and Second Centuries CE*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism 13. Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2004.

Mynors, R. A. B. *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College Oxford.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.

“Nachlass von Max Förster (1869–1954).” BSB OPACplus, n.d. https://opacplus.bsb-muenchen.de/metaopac/search?oclcno=775079290&db=100. Accessed July 2019.

Napier, Arthur S. “Contributions to Old English Literature.” In *An English Miscellany Presented to Dr. Furnivall in Honour of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, edited by William Paton Ker, Arthur S. Napier, and Walter W. Skeat, 355–81. Oxford: Clarendon, 1901.

———. “Ein altenglisches Leben des heiligen Chad.” *Anglia* 10 (1888): 131–56.

———. “In Memoriam Julius Zupitza.” *The Academy* 48, no. 1211 (July 20, 1895): 51.

———. *Old English Glosses*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1900.

———, ed. *Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit*. Sammlung englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben 4. Berlin: Weidmann, 1883. Reprint, Dublin: Weidmann, 1967.

Napier, Arthur S., and Max Roediger. “Julius Zupitza.” *Archiv* 95 (1895): 241–58.

Neville, Jennifer. “Selves, Souls, and Bodies: The Assumptions of the Virgin in Anglo-Saxon England.” In *Miracles and the Miraculous in Medieval Germanic and Latin Literature*, edited by K. E. Olsen, A. Harbus, and T. Hofstra, 141–54. Mediaevalia Groningana New Series 6, Germania Latina 5. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.

Nic Cárthaigh, Emma. “The Seven Heavens in the Modern Recension of *In Tenga Bithnua*.” In *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, edited by John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 1:211–84. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.

Nirenberg, David. *Anti-Judaism: The Western Tradition*. New York: Norton, 2013.

———. “Discourses of Judaizing and Judaism in Medieval Spain.” *La corónica: A Journal of Medieval Hispanic Languages, Literatures, and Cultures* 41, no. 1 (2012): 207–33.

Norberg, Dag. “Dyname Patrice de Marseilles.” *Journal of Medieval Latin* 1 (1991): 46–51.

Ó Carragáin, Éamonn. *Ritual and the Rood: Liturgical Images and the Old English Poems of the “Dream of the Rood” Tradition*. British Library Studies in Medieval Culture. London: British Library, 2005.

Ó Corráin, Donnchadh. *Clavis Litterarum Hibernensium: Medieval Irish Books and Texts (c. 400–c. 1600)*. Vol. 1. 3 vols. Corpus Christianorum, Claves. Turnhout: Brepols, 2017.

Ó Cróinín, Dáibhí. “Bischoff’s Wendepunkte Fifty Years On.” *Revue bénédictine* 110, no. 3–4 (2000): 204–37.

———. “A New Seventh-Century Irish Commentary on Genesis.” *Sacris Erudiri* 40 (2001): 231–65.

Ó Dochartaigh, Caitríona. “Homiletic Texts and the Transmission of Eschatological Apocrypha in a Medieval Irish Context.” *Apocrypha* 23 (2012): 141–53.

———. “*Na Seacht Neamha* in the *Liber Flavus Fergusiorum*.” In *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, edited by John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 1:201–10. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.

Ó Laoghaire, Diarmuid. “Irish Elements in the Catechesis Celtica.” In *Irland und die Christenheit: Bibelstudien und Mission*, edited by Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter, 146–64. Veröffentlichungen des Europa-Zentrums Tübingen, Kulturwissenschaftliche Reihe 3. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1987.

O’Brien, Conor. “Bede on Creation.” *Revue bénédictine* 123, no. 2 (2013): 255–73.

Ogawa, Hiroshi. *Language and Style in Old English Composite Homilies*. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 361. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2010.

———. “A ‘Wulfstan Imitator’ at Work: Linguistic Features of Napier XXX.” In *Studies in the History of Old English Prose*, edited by Hiroshi Ogawa, 263–85. Tokyo: Nan’un-do, 2000.

O’Mara, V. M., ed. *A Study and Edition of Selected Middle English Sermons*. Leeds Texts and Monographs: New Series, n. s. 13. Leeds: School of English, University of Leeds, 1994.

Omont, Henri, Auguste Molinier, Camille Couderc, and Ernest Coyecque. *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements. Tome XI: Chartres*. Paris: Plon, 1890.

Omont, Henri and Auguste Molinier. “Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum bibliothecae civitatis Carnotensis.” *Analecta Bollandiana* 8 (1889): 86–209.

Orchard, Andy. *A Critical Companion to Beowulf*. Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2003.

———. “Latin and the Vernacular Languages: The Creation of a Bilingual Textual Culture.” In *After Rome*, edited by Thomas M. Charles-Edwards, 191–219. The Short Oxford History of the British Isles. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

———. *Pride and Prodigies: Studies in the Monsters of the Beowulf-Manuscript*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1995.

———. “Wulfstan as Reader, Writer, and Rewriter.” In *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, edited by Aaron J. Kleist, 311–41. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.

Orchard, Nicholas, ed. *The Leofric Missal*. 2 vols. Henry Bradshaw Society 113–4. London: Boydell, 2002.

O’Sullivan, Tomás. “The Vision of Saint Paul: Redaction XI.” In *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, edited by John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 1:397–415. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.

Otero, D. Javier Soage. “La tradición anónima de textos edificantes en el alto medioevo latino: identificación y estudio de un corpus, con ediciones y transcripciones comentadas.” PhD diss., Universidad de Salamanca, 2017.

Oudin, Fanny. “Lettres de Dieu, lettres du Diable: Correspondances entre Terre, Ciel et Enfer.” *Questes* 19 (2010): 37–55.

Page, Raymond I. “An Old English Fragment from Westminster Abbey.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 25 (1996): 201–7.

Park, Katharine. “Cadden, Laqueur, and the ‘One-Sex Body.’” *Medieval Feminist Forum* 46.1 (2010): 96–100.

Pascual, Rafael J. “Ælfric’s Rhythmical Prose and the Study of Old English Metre.” *English Studies* 95, no. 7 (2014): 803–23.

Pelle, Stephen. “An Ælfrician Source for a Passage in the Worcester Fragments.” *Notes and Queries* n.s. 63, no. 2 (2016): 186–91.

———. “Embedded Latin Verses in Trinity Homily XXIX.” *Notes and Queries* n.s. 60, no. 4 (2013): 491–93.

———. “Lambeth Homily 4 and the Textual Tradition of the *Visio Pauli*.” In *By Definition: Studies in Medieval Literature and Lexicology in Honor of Antonette DiPaolo Healey*, edited by Maren Clegg-Hyer, Haruko Momma, and Samantha Zacher. Forthcoming.

———. “Newly Recovered English Homilies from Cotton Otho A. XIII.” *The Review of English Studies* n.s. 65, no. 269 (2013): 193–218.

———. “The Seven Pains of Hell: The Latin Source of an Old English Homiletic Motif.” *The Review of English Studies* n.s. 62, no. 254 (2011): 167–80.

———. “Source Studies in the Lambeth Homilies.” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 113, no. 1 (2014): 34–72.

———. “Sources and Analogues for Blickling Homily V and Vercelli Homily XI.” *Notes and Queries* n.s. 59, no. 1 (2012): 8–13.

Pellegrin, Élisabeth, and Jean-Paul Bouhot. *Catalogue des manuscrits médiévaux de la bibliothèque municipale d’Orléans*. Documents, études, et répertoires 78. Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2010.

Pope, John C., ed. *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*. 2 vols. Early English Text Society Original Series 259–260. London: Oxford University Press, 1967–68.

Porck, Thijs. *Old Age in Early Medieval England: A Cultural History*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 33. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 2019.

Porter, Dot, and Paul E. Szarmach. “Cambridge, Pembroke College 25: A Transcription.” n.d. https://schoenberginstitute.org/pembroke25/. Accessed July 2019.

Powel, Thomas. “Ebostol y sul.” *Y Cymmrodor* 8 (1887): 162–72.

Powell, Kathryn. “Viking Invasions and Marginal Annotations in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 37 (2008): 151–71.

Prete, Serafino. *I codici della Biblioteca Comunale di fermo: Catalogo*. Biblioteca di bibliografia italiana 35. Florence: Olschki, 1960.

———. “‘Ordinatio palatii regis Gundafohri’ dal manoscritto 33 della Biblioteca Civica di Fermo.” In *Miscellanea Giulio Belvederi*. Collezione Amici delle catacombe 23. Vatican City: Società “Amici delle catacombe,” 1954.

Priebsch, Robert. “The Chief Sources of Some Anglo-Saxon Homilies.” *Otia Merseiana* 1 (1899): 129–47.

———. *Letter from Heaven on the Observance of the Lord’s Day*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936.

Prinz, Otto. “Eine frühe abendländische Aktualisierung der lateinischen Übersetzung des Pseudo-Methodios.” *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 41 (1985): 1–23.

Pseudo-Basil. *De admonitio ad filium spiritualem*. In *Erforschung des Mittelalters*. Edited by Paul Lehmann, 5:201–45. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1962.

Pseudo-Bede. “The Commentary on the Pentateuch Attributed to Bede in PL 91.189–394.” Edited by Michael Gorman. *Revue bénédictine* 106 (1996): 61–108, 255–307. Reprinted in *Biblical Commentaries from the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Michael Gorman, 63–163. Millennio Medievale 032. Florence: SISMEL edizioni del Galluzzo, 2002.

Pulsiano, Philip. *An Annotated Bibliography of North American Doctoral Dissertations on Old English Language and Literature*. Medieval Texts and Studies 3. East Lansing, MI: Colleagues, 1988.

Quattrin, Patricia, trans. “Homily IX.” In *The Vercelli Book Homilies: Translations from the Anglo-Saxon*, edited by Lewis E. Nicholson, 65–71. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991.

Rabin, Andrew, ed. and trans. *The Political Writings of Archbishop Wulfstan of York*. Manchester Medieval Sources. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014.

Raith, J., ed. *Die altenglische Version des Halitgar’schen Bussbuches*. Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa 13. 1933. Reprint, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.

Rauer, Christine. *Beowulf and the Dragon: Parallels and Analogues*. Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2000.

———, ed. *The Old English Martyrology: Edition, Translation and Commentary*. Anglo-Saxon Texts 10. Cambridge: Brewer, 2013.

———. "Usage of the Old English Martyrology." In *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr. and Kees Dekker, 25–46. Mediaevalia Groningana New Series. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

Regan, Patrick. "The Three Days and the Forty Days." In *Between Memory and Hope: Readings on the Liturgical Year*, edited by Maxwell E. Johnson, 125–41. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.

Reinsma, Luke. *Ælfric: An Annotated Bibliography*. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities 617. New York: Garland, 1987.

Remley, Paul G. "The Vercelli Book and Its Texts: A Guide to Scholarship." In *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, edited by Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, 392–415. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Ricci, Cristina, ed. *Claudii Taurinensis Tractatus in epistola ad ephesios*. Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis 263. Turnhout: Brepols, 2014.

Ritari, Katja. "The Irish Eschatological Tale *The Two Deaths* and Its Sources." *Traditio* 68 (2013): 125–51.

———. "The Two Deaths." In *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, edited by John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 1:101–11. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.

Rittmueller, Jean, ed. *Liber questionum in evangeliis*. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 108F. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.

———. "MS Vat. Reg. 49 Reviewed: A New Description and a Table of Textual Parallels with the *Liber Questionum in Euangeliis*." *Sacris Erudiri* 33 (1992): 259–305.

Rivera Recio, Juan Francisco. “El ‘Homiliarium Gothicum’ de la Biblioteca Capitular de Toledo, homiliario romano del siglo IX/X.” *Hispania Sacra* 4 (1951): 147–67.

Roberts, Jane. “Consider Lazarus: A Context for Vercelli Homily VII.” In *Saints and Scholars: New Perspectives on Anglo-Saxon Literature and Culture in Honour of Hugh Magennis*, edited by Stuart McWilliams, 75–86. Cambridge: Brewer, 2012.

Robertson, D. W. *A Preface to Chaucer: Studies in Medieval Perspectives*. Princeton Legacy Library. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Robinson, Fred. “The Devil’s Account of the Next World: An Anecdote from Old English Homiletic Literature.” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 73, no. 1/3 (1972): 362–71. Reprinted in *The Editing of Old English*, 196–205. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

Robinson, Pamela R. “Self-Contained Units in Composite Manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Period.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 7 (1978): 231–38. Reprinted in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings*, edited by Mary P. Richards, 25–36. Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 5. New York: Garland, 1994.

Roger of Hoveden. *Chronica*. Edited by William Stubbs. 4 vols. Rolls Series. London: Longman, 1868–71.

Rosser, Susan. “The Sources of Blickling Homily 19.” Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register, 2000. http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/ (site discontinued). Accessed 31 August 2018.

Roth, Norman. “Jews and Albigensians, in the Middle Ages: Lucas of Tuy on Heretics in Leon.” *Sefarad* 41, no. 1 (1981): 71–93.

Rowley, Sharon M. *The Old English Version of Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 16. Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2011.

———. “A wese\n/dan nacodnisse and þa ecan þistru’: Language and Mortality in the Homily for Doomsday in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 41.” *English Studies* 84, no. 6 (2003): 493–510.

Rudolf, Winfried. “The Earliest Surviving Homily in English.” *Notes and Queries* n.s. 66, no. 1 (2019): 24–26.

———. “An Early Manuscript Witness of the Homiliaries of Angers and St. Père de Chartres in Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, MS Msc.Bibl.30a.” *Journal of Medieval Latin* 27 (2011): 1–40.

———. “The Editing of Old English: A Plea for Including Manuscript Facsimiles.” In *Mittelalterphilologien heute: Eine Standortbestimmung*. Vol 1, *Die germanischen Philologien*, edited by Alessandra Molinari, 173–186. Würzburg: Königshausen and Neumann, 2017.

———. “The Homiliary of Angers in Tenth-Century England.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 39 (2010): 163–92.

———. “Journey to the Borderland: Two Poetic Passages on Judgement Day in Old English Homilies Revisited.” In *Proceedings of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies Postgraduate Conference*, 1:1–13. Manchester: Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, 2005.

———. “Quoting and Translating Latin in the Old English Homilies of the Vercelli Book.” In *The Pragmatics of Quoting Now and Then*, edited by Jenny Arendholz, Wolfram Bublitz, and Monika Kirner-Ludwig, 271–90. Topics in English Linguistics 89. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.

———. “The Source and Textual Identity of ‘Homily’ Napier XXXI: Ælfric and the *Munuccild* of Saint-Maurice d’Agaune.” *The Review of English Studies* n.s. 57, no. 232 (2006): 607–22.

———. “The Spiritual Islescape of the Anglo-Saxons.” In *The Sea and Englishness in the Middle Ages: Maritime Narratives, Identity and Culture*, edited by Sebastian Sobecki, 31–57. Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2011.

———. “Wulfstan at Work: Recovering the Autographs of London, British Library, Additional, fols. 57r–58v.” In *Anglo-Saxon Micro-Texts*, edited by Ursula Lenker and Lucia Kornexl, 267–306. Anglia Book Series 67. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019.

———. “Variatio delectat: Altenglische Themapredigten als unfeste Texte.” PhD diss., University of Jena, 2005.

Rudolf, Winfried, and Susan Irvine, eds. Electronic Corpus of Anonymous Homilies in Old English, January 16, 2020. http://echoe.uni-goettingen.de/. Accessed March 2020.

Rushforth, Rebecca. “Cambridge, Pembroke College 25: The Manuscript and Its Historical Context.” Pembroke 25, 2012. http://www.dotporterdigital.org/pembroke/essays/Rushforth.pdf. Accessed July 2019.

Ryan, William M. “Four Unpublished Old English Homilies.” PhD diss., University of Texas, 1955.

Saenger, Paul. *A Catalogue of the Pre-1500 Western Manuscript Books at the Newberry Library*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Sandnes, Karl Olav. *Belly and Body in the Pauline Epistles*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 120. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Sandwell, Isabella. *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews, and Christians in Antioch*. Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Santoro, Mario. “Notizia su alcuni codici dei secoli x, xii, xiii conservati nella Biblioteca comunale di Fermo.” In *Le marche nei secoli XII e XIII: Problemi e ricerche—Atti del VI Convegno del Centro Di Studi Storici Maceratesi*, 45–50. Studi Maceratesi 6. Macerata: Centro di studi storici maceratesi, 1972.

Santos Otero, A. de. “Der apokryphe sogenannte Sonntagsbrief.” *Studia Patristica* 3 (1961): 290–96.

Sauer, Hans. “Die 72 Völker und Sprachen der Welt: Ein mittelalterlicher Topos in der englischen Literatur.” *Anglia* 101 (1983): 29–48.

———. “Max Förster (1869–1954).” In *Literature and Philology Medieval Scholarship: Biographical Studies on the Formation of a Discipline*. Vol. 2, *Literature and Philology*, edited by Helen Damico, 339–50. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities 2071. New York: Routledge, 1998.

———, ed. *Theodulfi Capitula in England: Die altenglischen Übersetzungen, zusammen mit dem lateinischen Text herausgegeben*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie 8. Munich: Fink, 1978.

Sawyer, P. H. *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*. Guides and Handbooks 8. London: Royal Historical Society, 1968. Reprinted online, www.esawyer.org.uk. Accessed July 2019.

Schabram, Hans. *Superbia: Studien zum altenglischen Wortschatz*. Vol. 1, *Die Dialektale und zeitliche Verbreitung des Wortguts*. Munich: Fink, 1965.

Schaff, Philip, trans. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 9 (New York: The Christian Literarture Company, 1890).

Schaller, Dieter. “*De mundi transitu*: A Rhythmical Poem by Columbanus?” In *Columbanus: Studies on the Latin Writings*, edited by Michael Lapidge, 240–54. Studies in Celtic History 17. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 1997.

Scharr, Claes. *Critical Studies in the Cynewulf Group*. Lund Studies in English 17. Lund: Haskell House, 1949.

Scheil, Andrew P. *The Footsteps of Israel: Understanding Jews in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Schenkl, Heinrich. *Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Britannica*. Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften 121. Vienna: Tempsky 1891–1908. Reprinted 3 vols. in 1. Hildesheim: Olms, 1969.

Schneyer, Johannes Baptist. *Repertorium der lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150–1350*. 11 vols. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters 43. Münster: Aschendorff, 1969–90.

Schöffler, Herbert. *Veröffentlichungen Max Försters anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstages am 8. März 1939*. Kölner anglistische Arbeiten 35. Bochum-Langendreer: Pöppinghaus, 1939.

Scragg, Donald G. "Anonymous Old English Homilies." In *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version*, edited by Frederick M. Biggs, Thomas D. Hill, and Paul E. Szarmach, 124–30. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 74. Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1990.

———. "Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162." In *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts and Their Heritage*, edited by Philip Pulsiano and Elaine M. Treharne, 71–83. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 1998.

———. "The Compilation of the Vercelli Book." *Anglo-Saxon England* 2 (1973): 189–207.

———. *A Conspectus of Scribal Hands Writing English: 960 – 1100*. Publications of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 11. Cambridge: Brewer, 2012.

———. "The Corpus of Anonymous Lives and Their Manuscript Context." In *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints' Lives and Their Contexts*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach, 209–30. SUNY Series in Medieval Studies. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1996.

———. "The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric." *Anglo-Saxon England* 8 (1979): 223–77. Reprinted with an appendix in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach, 73–150. Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 5. New York: Garland, 2000.

———. “The Devil’s Account of the Next World Revisited.” *American Notes and Queries* 24, no. 7–8 (1986): 107–10.

———. *Dating and Style in Old English Composite Homilies*. H. M. Chadwick Memorial Lectures 9. Cambridge: Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, University of Cambridge, 1999.

———. “Editing Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*.” *Anglia* 121, no. 4 (2003): 610–18.

———. “The Homilies of the Blickling Manuscript.” In *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes*, edited by Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss, 299–316. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

———. “Napier’s ‘Wulfstan’ Homily XXX: Its Sources, Its Relationship to the Vercelli Book and Its Style.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 6 (1977): 197–211.

———. “A Ninth-Century Old English Homily from Northumbria.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 45 (2017): 39–48.

———. “An Old English Homilist of Archbishop Dunstan’s Day.” In *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by Michael Korhammer, Karl Reichl, and Hans Sauer, 181–92. Cambridge: Brewer, 1992.

———. “Source Study.” In *Reading Old English Texts*, edited by Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe, 39–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

———. “The Vercelli Homilies and Kent.” In *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, edited by Virginia Blanton and Helene Scheck, 369–80. Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance 24. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 334. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2008.

———, ed. *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*. Early English Text Society Original Series 300. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Sedelius Scottus. *Collectaneum miscellaneum*. Edited by Dean Simpson. Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis 67. Turnhout: Brepols, 1988.

Seymour, St. John D. "The Seven Heavens in Irish Literature." *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 14 (1923): 18–30.

———. "The Testament of Mary: The Irish Account of the Death of the Virgin." *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 9 (1937): 341–64.

Shachar, Isaiah. *The Judensau: A Medieval Anti-Jewish Motif and Its History*. Warburg Institute Surveys 5. London: Warburg Institute, 1974.

Sharpe, Richard. "Reconstructing the Medieval Library of Bury St Edmunds Abbey: The Lost Catalogue of Henry of Kirkstead." In *Bury St Edmunds: Medieval Art, Architecture, Archaeology and Economy*, edited by Antonia Gransden, 204–218. British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 20. Leeds: Routledge, 1998.

Shepardson, Christine. "Controlling Contested Places: John Chrysostom's *Adversus Iudaeos* Homilies and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15, no. 4 (2007): 483–516.

Shoemaker, Stephen J. *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Silverstein, Theodore, ed. *Visio Sancti Pauli: The History of the Apocalypse in Latin together with Nine Texts*. Studies and Documents. London: Christophers, 1935.

Silverstein, Theodore, and Anthony Hilhorst, eds. *Apocalypse of Paul: A New Critical Edition of the Long Latin Versions*. Cahiers d'Orientalisme 21. Geneva: Cramer, 1997.

Sims-Williams, Patrick. "The Visionary Celt: The Construction of an Ethnic Preconception." *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 11 (1986): 71–96.

Sisam, Celia, ed. *The Vercelli Book: A Late Tenth-Century Manuscript Containing Prose and Verse (Vercelli Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII)*. Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 19. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1976.

Sisam, Kenneth. *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*. 1953. Reprint, Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

Skeat, Walter W., ed. *Ælfric's Lives of Saints: Being a Set of Sermons on Saints' Days Formerly Observed by the English Church*. 4 vols. Early English Text Society Original Series 76, 82, 94, 114. London: Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1881-1900. Reprinted in two volumes. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

———, ed. *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew and according to Saint Mark*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970. First published in two volumes as *The Gospel according to Saint Mark* and *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. Cambridge: University Press, 1871 and 1887.

Smetana, Cyril L. "Ælfric and the Early Medieval Homiliary." *Traditio* 15 (1959): 163–204.

———. "Paul the Deacon's Patristic Anthology." In *The Old English Homily and Its Backgrounds*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach and Bernard Felix Huppé, 75–97. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1978.

Smit, J. W. *Studies on the Language and Style of Columba the Younger (Columbanus)*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1971.

Smith, Thomas. *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Cottonianae*. Annotated by Humfrey Wanley. Edited by Colin G. C. Tite. Cambridge: Brewer, 1984.

Smyth, Marina, trans. "The Seventh-Century Hiberno-Latin Treatise *Liber de ordine creaturarum*. A Translation." *Journal of Medieval Latin* 21 (2011): 137–222.

———. *Understanding the Universe in Seventh-Century Ireland*. Studies in History Series 15. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 1996.

Snider, Harry C. "The Old English Homily 'Dominica tertia in quadragesima' in Ms. Junius 86." 1940.

Solo, Harry Jay. "The Influence of Caesarius of Arles on Two Old English Homilies." *Notes and Queries* n.s. 26, no. 3 (1978): 196–97.

Sonntag, Jörg. *Klosterleben im Spiegel des Zeichenhaften: Symbolisches Denken und Handeln hochmittelalterlicher Mönche zwischen Dauer und Wandel, Regel und Gewohnheit*. Vita Regularis 35. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2008.

Spencer, Helen L. "Vernacular and Latin Versions of a Sermon for Lent: 'A Lost Penitential Homily' Found." *Mediaeval Studies* 44 (1982): 271–305.

Springer, Carl P. E. *The Manuscripts of Sedulius: A Provisional Handlist*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 85.5. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1995.

Stacey, Robert C. "Anti-Semitism and the Medieval English State." In *The Medieval State: Essays Presented to James Campbell*, edited by John Maddicott and D. M. Palliser, 163–77. London: Hambledon, 2000.

Stanley, Eric Gerald. "An Inedited Nativity Sermon from Worcester." *English and Germanic Studies* 7 (1961): 53–79.

———. "*The Judgement of the Damned*, from Corpus Christi College Cambridge 201 and Other Manuscripts, and the Definition of Old English Verse." In *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England. Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss, 363–91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. Reprinted in *A Collection of Papers with Emphasis on Old English Literature*, edited by Eric Gerald Stanley, 352–83. Publications of the Dictionary of Old English 3. Toronto: Brepols, 1987.

Stegmüller, Friedrich, and Nikolaus Reinhardt, eds. *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*. 11 vols. Madrd: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1950–1980.

Stenton, Frank. *Anglo-Saxon England*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Stevenson, Jane. "Ascent through the Heavens, from Egypt to Ireland." *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 5 (1983): 21–35.

Stilwell, Robert Sven. “A Glossary for the Vercelli Prose Homilies.” PhD diss., University of Texas, 1947.

Stotz, Peter. *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*. 5 vols. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.5. Munich: Beck, 1996–2004.

Swan, Mary. “Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies in the Twelfth Century.” In *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, edited by Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne, 62–82. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

———. “Holiness Remodelled: The Theme and Technique in Old English Composite Homilies.” In *Models of Holiness in Medieval Sermons: Proceedings of the International Symposium (Kalamazoo, 4–7 May 1995)*, edited by Beverly Mayne Kienzle, 35–46. Textes et études du moyen âge 5. Louvain-la-Neuve: Brepols, 1996.

———. “Old English Made New: One Catholic Homily and Its Reuses.” *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 28 (1997): 1–18.

Swan, Mary, and Elaine M. Treharne, eds. *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Symons, Thomas, ed. *Regularis Concordia: The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Szarmach, Paul E. “Alfred’s *Boethius* and the Four Cardinal Virtues.” In *Alfred the Wise: Studies in Honour of Janet Bately on the Occasion of Her Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by Jane Roberts and Janet L. Nelson with Malcolm Godden, 223–35. Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1997.

———. “Caesarius of Arles and the *Vercelli Homilies*.” *Traditio* 26 (1970): 315–23.

———. “Cotton Tiberius A. iii, Arts. 26 and 27.” In *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of His Sixty-*

Fifth Birthday, edited by Michael Korhammer with the assistance of Karl Reichl and Hans Sauer, 29–42. Cambridge: Brewer 1992.

———. "Pembroke College 25, Arts. 93–95." In *Via Crucis: Essays on Early Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross*, edited by Thomas N. Hall with assistance from Thomas D. Hill and Charles D. Wright, 295–325. Medieval European Studies 1. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press, 2002.

———. "The Vercelli Homilies: Style and Structure." In *The Old English Homily and Its Backgrounds*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach and Bernard Felix Huppé, 241–67. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1978.

———, ed. *Vercelli Homilies XI–XXIII*. Toronto Old English Series 5. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Talley, Thomas J. *The Origins of the Liturgical Year*. New York: Liturgical Press, 1986.

Tangl, Michael, ed. *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*. 2nd ed. Monumenta Germaniae historica, Epistolae selectee 1. Berlin: Weidmannsche, 1955.

Teresi, Loredana, ed. "*Be Heofonwarum 7 Be Helwarum*: A Complete Edition." In *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, edited by Elaine M. Treharne and Susan Rosser, 211–44. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 252. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002.

———, "'Mnemonic' Transmission of Old English Texts in the Post-Conquest Period." In *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, edited by Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne, 98–116. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

ThEMA: Thesaurus exemplorum Medii Aevi. n.d. http://gahom.huma-num.fr/thema/index.php. Accessed 1 April 2020.

Thompson, James Westfall. *The Medieval Library*. New York: Hafner, 1957.

Thompson, Nancy M. “Anglo-Saxon Orthodoxy.” In *Old English Literature in Its Manuscript Context*, edited by Joyce Tally Lionarons, 37–66. Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2004.

———. “*Hit Segð on Halgum Bocum*: The Logic of Composite Old English Homilies.” *Philological Quarterly* 81, no. 4 (2002): 383–419.

Thomson, R. M. *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library* Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1989.

———. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of Merton College, Oxford*. Cambridge: Brewer, 2009.

———. “The Library of Bury St Edmunds Abbey in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries.” *Speculum* 47, no. 4 (1972): 617–45.

Thorpe, Benjamin. *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. London: Ælfric Society, 1844–66.

Tibber, Peter Harris. “The Origins of the Scholastic Sermon, c. 1130–c. 1210.” PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1983.

Timofeeva, Olga. “Anglo-Latin Bilingualism before 1066: Prospects and Limitations.” In *Interfaces between Language and Culture in Medieval England: A Festschrift for Matti Kilpio*, edited by Alaric Hall, Olga Timofeeva, Ágnes Kiricsi, and Bethany Fox, 1–36. The Northern World 48. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Tischendorf, Constantin von. *Acta Apostolorum apocrypha*. Leipzig: Avenarius et Mendelssohn, 1851.

———. *Apocalypses apocryphae: Mosis, Esdrae, Pauli, Johannis, item Mariae Dormitio: Additis Evangeliorum et Actuum Apocryphorum Supplementis*. Leipzig: Hermann Mendelssohn, 1866.

———. *Evangelia Apocrypha*. 2nd ed. 1853. Reprint, Leipzig: Hermann Mendelssohn, 1876.

Toller, T. Northcote. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth: Supplement*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1921.

Torkar, Roland. "Die Ohnmacht der Textkritik, am Beispiel der Ausgaben der dritten *Vercelli-Homilie*." In *Anglo-Saxonica: Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der englischen Sprache und zur altenglischen Literatur. Festschrift für Hans Schabram zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Klaus R. Grinda and Claus-Dieter Wetzel, 225–50. Munich: Fink, 1993.

Touati, Charlotte. "The 'Apocalypse of the Seven Heavens': From Egypt to Ireland." In *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, edited by John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 1:171–88. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.Townend, Matthew, ed. *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.

Trahern, Joseph B., Jr. "Caesarius of Arles." Sources of Old English and Anglo-Latin Literary Culture [Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture], n.d. http://www.bede.net/saslc/entries.html. Accessed July 2018.

———. "Caesarius of Arles and Old English Literature: Some Contributions and a Recapitulation." *Anglo-Saxon England* 5 (1976): 105–19.

Treharne, Elaine M. "The Bishop's Book: Leofric's Homiliary and Eleventh-Century Exeter." In *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, edited by Stephan Baxter, Catherine E. Karkov, Janet L. Nelson, and David Pelteret, 521–37. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2008.

———. "The Form and Function of the Vercelli Book." In *Text, Image, Interpretation: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature and Its Insular Context in Hour of Éamonn Ó Carragáin*, edited by Alastair Minnis and Jane Roberts, 253–66. Studies in the Early Middle Ages. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.

———. “Scribal Connections in Late Anglo-Saxon England.” In *Texts and Traditions of Medieval Pastoral Care: Essays in Honour of Bella Millett*, edited by Cate Gunn and Catherine Innes-Parker, 29–46. New York: York Medieval Press, 2009.

———. “Producing a Library in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Exeter, 1050–1072.” *The Review of English Studies* n.s. 54, no. 214 (2003): 155–72.

———. “The Production and Script of Manuscripts Containing English Religious Texts in the First Half of the Twelfth Century.” In *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, edited by Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne, 11–40. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Tristram, Hildegard L. C. “Die *leohtfæt*-Metapher in den altenglischen anonymen Bittagspredigten.” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 75, no. 2 (1974): 229–49.

———. “The Early Insular Elegies: ITEM ALIA.” In *Celtic Linguistics/Ieithyddiaeth Geltaidd: Readings in the Brythonic Languages*, edited by Martin J. Ball, James Fife, Erich Poppe, and Jenny Rowland, 348–49. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, 4.68. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1990.

———. *Early Insular Preaching: Verbal Artistry and Method of Composition*. Sitzungsberichte: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 623, Veröffentlichungen der Keltischen Kommission 11. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1995.

———. “Stock Descriptions of Heaven and Hell in Old English Prose and Poetry.” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 79, no. 2 (1978): 102–13.

———. “Vier altenglische Predigten aus der heterodoxen Tradition, mit Kommentar, Übersetzung und Glossar sowie drei weiteren Texten im Anhang.” PhD diss., University Freiburg im Breisgau, 1970.

Turville-Petre, Joan. “Translations of a Lost Penitential Homily.” *Traditio* 19 (1963): 51–78.

Twomey, Michael. “Pseudo-Methodius Revelations.” In *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha*, edited by Frederick M. Biggs, 18–20. Instrumenta Anglistica Mediaevalia 1. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007.

Upchurch, Robert K. “A Call to Alms: Ælfric’s Condemnation of Hoarding in *Catholic Homily* II.7.” *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 115 (2016): 413–41.

Utz, Richard J. *Chaucer and the Discourse of German Philology: A History of Reception and an Annotated Bibliography of Studies, 1793-1948*. Making the Middle Ages 3. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.

Valtorta, Benedetta, ed. *Clavis Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi. Auctores Italiae (700–1000)*. Edizione nazionale dei testi mediolatini 17. Serie 1.10 (Florence: SISMEL Edizione del Galluzzo, 2006.

Verbraken, Patrick, ed. “Les sermons CCXV et LVI de saint Augustin. De symbolo et De oratione dominica.” *Revue bénédictine* 68 (1958): 5–40.

Vezin, J. “Leofnoth, un scribe anglais à Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire.” *Codices Manuscripti* 3, no. 4 (1977): 109–20.

Vleeskruyer, Richard, ed. *The Life of St. Chad: An Old English Homily*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1953.

Volmering, Nicole. “The Old English Account of the Seven Heavens.” In *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, edited by John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 1:285–306. A New History of the Sermon. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.

Voth, Christine. “Bald’s Leechbook.” In *The Encyclopedia of Medieval Literature in Britain*, edited by Siân Echard and Robert Rouse, 224–26. Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Literature. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd., 2017.

Wack, Mary F., and Charles D. Wright. “A New Latin Source for the Old English ‘Three Utterances’ Exemplum.” *Anglo-Saxon England* 20 (1991): 187–202.

Wallis, Faith. “Medicine in Medieval Calendar Manuscripts.” In *Manuscript Sources of Medieval Medicine: A Book of Essays*, edited by Margaret Rose Schleissner, 105–43. Garland Medieval Casebooks 8. New York: Garland Publishing, 1995.

Wanley, Humphrey. *Librorum veterum septentrionalium catalogus*. Vol. 2 of *Linguarum veterum septentrionalium thesaurus*, edited by George Hickes. Vol. 2. Oxford, 1705.

Warner, G. P., and J. P. Gilson. *Catalogue of Royal and King’s Manuscripts in the British Museum*. 4 vols. London: The Trustees, 1921.

Wasserschleben, Hermann, ed. *Collectio canonum hibernensis*. In *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, 2nd ed. Darmstadt: Scientia, 1966.

Webber, Teresa. *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral c. 1075–c. 1125*. Oxford Historical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Weenen, Andrea de Leeuw van, ed. *The Icelandic Homily Book: Perg. 15 4° in the Royal Library, Stockholm*. Icelandic Manuscripts Series in Quarto 3. Reykjavík: Stofnun Árna Magnússonar á Íslandi, 1993.

Weiskott, Eric. *English Alliterative Verse: Poetic Tradition and Literary History*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Werminghoff, Albert, ed. *Concilia aevi Karolini*. Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Concilia aevi Karolini 2. Hannover: Hahn, 1906.

Whitelock, D., M. Brett, and C. N. L. Brooke, eds. *Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church, I: A.D. 871–1204*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.

Whitelock, Dorothy. “Bishop Ecgred, Pehtred and Niall.” In *Ireland in Early Medieval Europe: Studies in Memory of Kathleen Hughes*, edited by Dorothy Whitelock, Rosamond McKitterick, and David N. Dumville, 47–68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

———, ed. *The Exeter Guild Statutes*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Whitenack, Claire L. “Poison and Disease in Anglo-Saxon Medicine and Metaphor.” PhD diss., Cornell University, 2019.

Wiedel, Birgit. “Laughing at the Beast: The *Judensau*: Anti-Jewish Propaganda and Humor from the Middle Ages to the Early Modern Period.” In *Laughter in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times: Epistemology of a Fundamental Human Behavior, Its Meaning, and Consequences*, edited by Albrecht Classen, 325–64. New York: De Gruyter, 2010.

Wilcox, Jonathan, ed. *Ælfric’s Prefaces*. Durham Medieval Texts 9. Durham: Durham Medieval Texts, Department of English Studies, 1994.

———. *Homilies by Ælfric and Other Homilies*. Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfische Facsimile 17. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2008.

———. “Understatement and Incongruity: Humour in the Literature of Anglo-Saxon England.” In *Humour in the Arts: New Perspectives*, edited by Vivienne Westbrook and Shun-liang Chao, 59–77. New York: Routledge, 2019.

———. “The Use of Ælfric’s Homilies: MSS Oxford Bodleian Library, Junius 85 and 86 in the Field.” In *A Companion to Ælfric*, edited by Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan, 345–68. Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition 18. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

———. “The Wolf on Shepherds: Wulfstan, Bishops, and the Context of the *Sermo Lupi Ad Anglos*.” In *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, edited by Paul E. Szarmach, 395–418. Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England 5, Garland Reference Library of the Humanities 1447. New York: Garland, 2000.

———. “Wulfstan and the Twelfth Century.” In *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, edited by Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne, 83–97. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Wilken, Robert Louis. *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Wilhelmsson, Ingrid. "Studien zu Mutianus dem Chrysostomosübersetzer." PhD diss., Lund, 1944.

Willard, Rudolph. "The Address of the Soul to the Body." *PMLA* 50, no. 4 (1935): 957–83.

———, ed. *The Blickling Homilies*. Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 10. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1960.

———. "The Blickling-Junius Tithing Homily and Caesarius of Arles." In *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies*, edited by Thomas A. Kirby and Henry B. Woolf, 65–78. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1949.

———. "La ville d'Agathé? Note sur le *Transitus Mariae C*." *Échos d'Orient* 38, no. 195–196 (1939): 346–54.

———. "The Latin Texts of *The Three Utterances of the Soul*." *Speculum* 12, no. 2 (1937): 147–66.

———. "Max Förster. 8 March 1869–10 November 1954." *The Review of English Studies* n.s. 6, no. 21 (1955): 273–79.

———. "An Old English 'Magnificat.'" *Studies in English* 20 (1940): 5–28.

———. "On Blickling Homily XIII: *The Assumption of the Virgin.* The Source and the Missing Passages." *The Review of English Studies* 12, no. 45 (1936): 1–17.

———. "The Two Accounts of the Assumption in Blickling Homily XIII." *The Review of English Studies* 14, no. 53 (1938): 1–19.

———. *Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies*. Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 30. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1935.

———. "The Vercelli Homilies: An Edition of Homilies I, IV, V, VII, VIII, XI and XII in Old English Prose from the Vercelli Codex CXVII." PhD diss., Yale University, 1925.

———. "Vercelli Homily XI and Its Sources." *Speculum* 24, no. 1 (1949): 76–87.

———. “Vercelli Homily VIII and the *Christ*.” *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 42, no. 2 (1927): 314–30.

Willems, Radbodus, ed. *Aurelii Augustini Opera*. 2nd ed. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina. Turnhout: Brepols, 1990.

Williams, Ann. “Godwine [Godwin], Earl of Wessex.” In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, September 23, 2004. DOI: 10.1093/ref:odnb/10887. Accessed July 2019.

Williams, Edith Whitehurst. “What’s So New about the Sexual Revolution? Some Comments on Anglo-Saxon Attitudes toward Sexuality in Women Based on Four Exeter Book Riddles.” *Texas Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (1975): 46–55.

Wilmart, André. *Analecta Reginensia: Extraits Des manuscrits latins de la reine Christine conservés au Vatican*. Studi e testi 59. 1933. Reprint, Vatican City: Bibl. Apostolica Vaticana, 1984.

Wilson VanVeller, Courtney. “John Chrysostom and the Troubling Jewishness of Paul.” In *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, edited by Chris L. De Wet and Wendy Mayer, 32–57. Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Winterbottom, Michael, ed. *Gildas, The Ruin of Britain and Other Documents.* Arthurian Period Sources 7. Chichester, Phillimore, 1978.

Wisén, Theodor. *Homiliu-bók: Isländska homilier efter en handskrift från tolfte århundradet*. Lund: Gleerup, 1872.

Withers, Benjamin C. *The Illustrated Old English Hexateuch, Cotton Claudius B.Iv: The Frontier of Seeing and Reading in Anglo-Saxon England*. Studies in Book and Print Culture. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Wood, I. N. “The Irish in England and on the Continent in the Seventh Century: Part II.” *Peritia* 27 (2016): 189–216.

Wormald, Patrick. “Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh Century State-Builder.” In *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, edited by Matthew Townend, 9–28. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 10. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.

———. *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century.* Vol. 1*, Legislation and Its Limits*. Maiden, MA: Blackwell, 1999.

Wrenn, C. L. Review of *Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies*, by Rudolph Willard. *Medium Ævum* 6, no. 2 (1937): 162–66.

Wright, Charles D. “*The Apocalypse of Thomas*: Some New Latin Texts and Their Significance for the Old English Versions.” In *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England*, edited by Kathryn Powell and Donald G. Scragg, 27–64. Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 2. Cambridge: Brewer, 2003.

———. “Apocrypha Priscillianistica.” In *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha*, edited by Frederick M. Biggs, 73–74. Instrumenta Anglistica Mediaevalia 1. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007.

———. “Apocryphal Lore and Insular Tradition in St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek MS 908.” In *Irland und die Christenheit: Bibelstudien und Mission / Ireland and Christendom: The Bible and the Missions*, edited by Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter, 124–45. Veröffentlichungen des Europa Zentrums Tübingen. Kulturwissenschaftliche Reihe 3. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1987.

———. “Bischoff’s Theory of Irish Exegesis and the Genesis Commentary in Munich Clm 6302: A Critique of a Critique.” *Journal of Medieval Latin* 12 (2000): 115–75.

———. “Blickling Homily III on the Temptations in the Desert.” *Anglia* 106 (1988): 130–37.

———. *De Plasmatione Adam*. In *The Embroidered Bible: Studies in Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Honour of Michael E. Stone*, edited by Lorenzo DiTommaso,

Matthias Henze, and Willam Adler, 941–1003. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 26. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

———. "*Docet Deus, Docet Diabolus*: A Hiberno-Latin Theme in an Old English Body-and-Soul Homily." *Notes and Queries* n.s. 34, no. 4 (1987): 451–53.

———. "A Doomsday Passage in an Old English Homily for Lent, Revisited." *Anglia* 128, no. 1 (2010): 28–47.

———. "Hiberno-Latin and Irish-Influenced Biblical Commentaries, Florilegia, and Homily Collections." In *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version*, edited by Frederick M. Biggs, Thomas D. Hill, and Paul E. Szarmach, 87–123. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 74. Binghamton, NY: State University of New York Press, 1990.

———. "Hiberno-Latin Literature." Oxford Bibliographies, February 22, 2018. http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195396584/obo-9780195396584-0249.xml. Accessed July 2019.

———. "The Interim State of Souls in Early Irish Literature." In *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, edited by John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 1:301–96. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.

———. *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*. Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 6. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

———. "Latin Analogue for *The Two Deaths: The Three Utterances of the Soul*." In *The End and Beyond: Medieval Irish Eschatology*, edited by John Carey, Emma Nic Cárthaigh, and Caitríona Ó Dochartaigh, 1:113–38. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2014.

———. "More Latin Sources for the Old English 'Three Utterances' Homilies." *Mediaeval Studies* 17 (2015): 45–79.

———. “More Old English Poetry in Vercelli Homily XXI.” In *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, edited by Elaine M. Treharne and Susan Rosser, 245–62. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 252. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002.

———. “A New Latin Source for Two Old English Homilies (Fadda I and Blickling I): Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* App. 125, and the Ideology of Chastity in the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine Reform.” In *Source of Wisdom: Old English and Early Medieval Latin Studies in Honour of Thomas D. Hill*, edited by Charles D. Wright, Frederick M. Biggs, and Thomas N. Hall, 239–65. Toronto Old English Series 16. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2007.

———. “Old English Homilies and Latin Sources.” In *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice and Appropriation*, edited by Aaron J. Kleist, 15–66. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.

———. “Seven Heavens Apocryphon.” In *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha*, edited by Frederick M. Biggs, 78–79. Instrumenta Anglistica Mediaevalia 1. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007.

———. “Some New Versions of *The Apocalypse of Thomas* and Their Significance for the Old English Versions.” In *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England*, edited by Donald G. Scragg and Kathryn Powell, 27–64. Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 2. Cambridge: Brewer, 2003.

———. “Three Utterances Apocryphon.” In *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha*, edited by Frederick M. Biggs, 80–83. Instrumenta Anglistica Mediaevalia 1. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007.

———. “Vercelli Homilies XI–XIII and the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine Reform: Tailored Sources and Implied Audiences.” In *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle*

Ages, edited by Carolyn A. Muessig, 203–27. A New History of the Sermon 3. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

———. "Vercelli Homily XV and *The Apocalypse of Thomas*." In *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, edited by Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, 150–84. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

———. "Why the Left Hand Is Longer (or Shorter) than the Right: Some Irish Analogues for An Etiological Legend in the Homiliary of St. Père de Chartres." In *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, edited by Virginia Blanton and Helene Scheck, 161–68. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 334. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2008.

Wright, Charles D., and Roger Wright. "Additions to the Bobbio Missal: De Dies Malus and Joca Monachorum (Ff. 6r–8v)." In *The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul*, edited by Yitzhak Hen and Rob Meens, 79–139. Cambridge Studies in Paleography and Codicology 11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Younge, George. "The New Heathens: Anti-Jewish Hostility in Early English Literature." In *Writing Europe, 500–1450: Texts and Contexts*, edited by Aidan Conti, Orietta Da Rold, and Philip Shaw, 123–46. Essays and Studies 68. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2015.

Zacher, Samantha, ed. *Imagining the Jew in Anglo-Saxon Literature and Culture*. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 21. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016.

———. *Preaching the Converted: The Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Book Homilies*. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 1. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

———. "Rereading the Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Homilies." In *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, edited by Aaron J. Kleist, 173–207. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 17. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.

———. “The Source of Vercelli VII: An Address to Women.” In *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, edited by Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, 98–149. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 4. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2009.Zacher, Samantha, and Andy Orchard, eds. *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 4. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2009.

Zaffuto, Rosa. “Edizione e analisi dell’omelia ‘Ic bidde and eadmodlice lære men þa leofestan’ (Ms. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201).” PhD diss., University of Rome III, 1999.

Zimpel, Detlev, ed. *Hrabanus Maurus, De institutione clericorum*. 2 vols. Fontes Christiani 61. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.

Zumthor, Paul. *Essai de poétique médiévale*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1972.

Zupitza, Julius. “Zu ‘Seele und Leib.’” *Archiv* 91 (1893): 369–404.

———. “Zur Frage nach der Quelle von Cynewulfs Andreas.” *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 30 (1886): 175–85.

Zweck, Jordan. *Epistolary Acts: Anglo-Saxon Letters and Early English Media*. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 29. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018.

———. “Letters from Heaven in the British Isles, 800–1500.” PhD Diss., Yale University, 2010.

Indexes

tba